

Karl

MARX

and Our Time

**Progress Publishers
Moscow**

Karl Marx and Our Time

Karl Marx and Our Time

**Articles
and Speeches**



**Progress Publishers
Moscow**

Translated from the Russian
Designed by *Vadim Kuleshov*

КАРЛ МАРКС И СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ

На английском языке

C-88756

© Политиздат, 1983

English translation © Progress Publishers 1983

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

К $\frac{0104000000-471}{014 (01)-83}$ без объявл.

CONTENTS

Publishers' Note	7
<i>Yuri Andropov</i> . Karl Marx's Teaching and Some of the Problems in the Building of Socialism in the USSR	9
<i>Boris Ponomarev</i> . Marx's Doctrine—a Guide to Action	36
<i>Mikhail Zimyanin</i> . Karl Marx's Teaching Lives On and Triumphs	60
<i>Pyotr Fedoseyev</i> . Karl Marx and the Dialectics of Our Time . .	76
<i>Richard Kosolapov</i> . Marx Is Always Abreast of the Times . . .	118
<i>Vadim Zagladin, Stanislav Menshikov, Ivan Frolov</i> . Karl Marx and the Emancipation of Man as a World Historical Process .	160
<i>Theodor Oizerman</i> . A revolutionary Landmark in the Development of Social Thought	186
<i>Bonifatii Kedrov</i> . Marx and Science	195

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

A century has passed since the death of Karl Marx.

The ideas which he and his great friend Frederick Engels pioneered, and which were later developed by Lenin, not only command the minds of progressive humanity. For two-thirds of that century the new, socialist civilisation has been in the process of construction.

Marxism-Leninism has become the highest synthesis of the thought of the titans of revolution. It combines the great discoveries that lie at the foundation of contemporary social thought.

Marxism-Leninism, whose main component is the theory of socialism and communism, has become a theory which, consciously applied, has resulted in the building of real socialism.

In the shape of Marxism-Leninism, a scientific theory that can be used as a tool for actually transforming society has emerged on the historical stage. Its versatile strength lies in the vigorous response it awakes in all parts of the globe. There is not a single country or social group that does not experience its beneficial influence.

This book indicates the paths along which this enormously influential theory will develop.

YURI ANDROPOV

**General Secretary
of the CPSU Central Committee**

**KARL MARX'S TEACHING
AND SOME OF THE PROBLEMS
IN THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM
IN THE USSR**

One hundred years have passed since the death of Karl Marx. A whole century. A century of dramatic upheavals, revolutionary storms and fundamental changes in mankind's destiny; a century which has refuted and swept away a multitude of philosophical concepts, social theories and political doctrines. It has been a century of successive victories by Marxism, of its growing impact on social development.

With the march of time, the meaning and scale of Karl Marx's lifelong feat become increasingly clear.

For millennia people have been looking for a way to restructure society on a just basis, to rid themselves of exploitation, coercion, and material and intellectual poverty. Great minds have devoted themselves to that quest. Generation after generation, fighters for the people's happiness sacrificed their lives for that goal. But it was in Marx's titanic activities that the investigations of a great scholar merged for the first time with the dedicated practical work of a leader and organiser of the revolutionary movement of the masses.

Marx is rightly considered the successor to all the best that was created by classical German philosophy, English political economy and French utopian socialism. But, after critically reassessing their achievements, he went much further. First and foremost, because he undertook a task which he formulated with depth and simplicity, as befits a genius: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it."¹ Marx devoted all the power of his remarkable mind and his entire life to the cause of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

A distinctive feature of Marxism is the unity of consistently scientific theory and revolutionary practice. Marx's scientific work could only have unfolded in inseparable connection with the independent entry into the political arena of the pro-

¹ K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 8.

Here and further on, the quotations of Marx and Engels are taken from K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow (English-language edition), unless otherwise indicated.

letariat, then a very young class historically. Marx had the good fortune to see how the prophetic words he had pronounced in his youth were translated into reality: "As philosophy finds its *material* weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its *spiritual* weapons in philosophy."¹

The philosophy which Marx gave the working class was a revolution in the history of social thought. Humanity did not even know a fraction as much about itself as it has learnt thanks to Marxism. Marx's teaching, presented in the organic integrity of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory of scientific communism, was a real revolution in world outlook and simultaneously illuminated the road to the most profound social revolutions.

Marx revealed the objective, basically material, laws of the march of history. He discovered them where previously everything had seemed to be either a trick of chance, the despotism of individuals, or had been presented as the self-expression of a mythical world spirit. He perceived the essence behind the visible, the apparent, behind the phenomenon. He ripped the shroud of secrecy from capitalist production, from the exploitation of labour by capital; he showed how surplus value is created and by whom it is appropriated.

Frederick Engels, Marx's great friend and companion-in-arms, attached special importance to Marx's two major discoveries—the materialist interpretation of history and the theory of surplus value. And it is easy to see why. These discoveries made it possible to turn socialism from a utopia into a science, to provide a scientific interpretation of the class struggle. They made possible what Lenin described as the chief component of Marx's doctrine: the elucidation of "the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society".²

¹ K. Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law", *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 187.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973, p. 582.

Here and further on, the quotations of Lenin are taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow (English-language edition), unless otherwise indicated.

Yes, Karl Marx was a great scholar. But he was also a great practical revolutionary. It is astonishing how much he was able to do for the attainment of the goals that he had indicated.

Marx, together with Engels, founded the Communist League—the first political organisation of the class-conscious, revolutionary proletariat. He was thus the first Communist in the most contemporary meaning of the word, the pioneer of today's world-wide movement.

"Nothing but an international bond of the working classes can ever ensure their definitive triumph,"¹ wrote Marx. And he himself, the founder of the First International, worked tirelessly to forge international workers' unity. The political behests of Marx and Engels to the Communists of the world are inconceivable without the fiery call, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

Marx, convinced internationalist that he was, was unsurpassed at grasping the specifics of the situation in the most varied countries—from England to India, from France to China, and from the USA to Ireland. At the same time, when closely examining the life of a people, he constantly sought its interconnection with the life of the whole world. And here he always posed the fundamental question: who will begin the revolutionary destruction of the capitalist order and who will be the first to set out on the road to humanity's communist future?

History provided the answer to this question. It fell to the lot of the proletariat of Russia to be the revolutionary trailblazers. Even today there are "critics" of the October Revolution who assert that it took place contrary to all of Marx's expectations. They pretend that Marx did not take Russia into account at all in his revolutionary forecasts. But in actual fact he showed a great interest in Russian affairs and learned Russian in order to understand them better. An irreconcilable opponent of tsarism, he prophetically assessed the prospects of the mounting social movement in Russia, and saw that in it was ripening a "most grandiose social revolution"², which would be of world-

¹ *The General Council of the First International, 1866-1868*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 329.

² See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 32, Berlin, 1965, S. 659.

wide significance. Indeed, Marx was even a better judge of future events than some present-day "critics" are of events of the past.

Engels said that Marx's death left a yawning gap in the ranks of the embattled proletariat. It was indeed an immense loss. But Marx's banner remained in reliable hands. It was carried aloft by Engels himself, who stood at the head of the rising revolutionary working-class movement. It was in Engels's lifetime that Vladimir Ilyich Lenin entered the arena of the proletarian class struggle.

Lenin was a loyal follower of Marx and Engels. As he himself said, he could not tolerate even the slightest aspersion cast on his great teachers. That was only to be expected of the man who did more than anyone else not only for the defence of Marxism, but also, under new historical conditions, for the creative development of all its component parts and for its practical implementation. He elevated Marxism to a new and higher stage. Lenin's name is inseparable from the name of Marx. Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the collapse of the colonial system, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. In our time Marxism is simply impossible outside of and without Leninism.

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party he founded led the first victorious socialist revolution, which has radically changed the sociopolitical make-up of the world. Thus a new era was ushered in—the era of the grand accomplishments and historic gains of the working class and the mass of the people. Thus scientific socialism, created by Marx, has merged with the actual practice of the millions of working people building a new society.

Today the rich content of Marx's teaching is being revealed to us much more widely and deeply than to his contemporaries, for it is one thing to perceive the idea of the historical need for socialism in its theoretical form and quite another to be both a participant in and witness of that idea's implementation.

The rise of socialism did not take place, in all respects, in the concrete historical ways which the founders of our revolutionary

theory had expected. First socialism triumphed in a single country which, moreover, was not the most developed one economically. The crux of the matter lies in that the October Revolution took place in the epoch of imperialism, under new historical conditions which had not existed in Marx's lifetime. This was mirrored in Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, which has been fully corroborated by life.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists are to this day building whole systems of arguments in an attempt to prove that the new society built in the USSR and the other fraternal countries differs from the image of socialism which Marx visualised. They say that the reality and the ideal are at variance. But, wittingly or through ignorance, they overlook the fact that, in elaborating his teaching, Marx himself was guided least of all by the requirements of some abstract ideal of a neat, sleek "socialism". He deduced his ideas of the future system from an analysis of the objective contradictions of large-scale capitalist production. It is this science-based approach which enabled him to determine correctly the main features of the society which was yet to be born in the purifying thunderstorms of the social revolutions in the 20th century.

According to Marx, social property in the means of production is the cornerstone of the socio-economic system that replaces capitalism. The clear-cut words of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* emphasised the significance which Marxism attaches to this necessary revolution in production relations: "...the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."¹

The historical experience of real, existing socialism shows that it is no simple matter to turn "mine"—privately-owned—into "ours"—collectively-owned. The revolution in property relations can by no means be reduced to a single act, as a result of which the basic means of production become the property of the whole people. Acquiring ownership rights and becoming a real, wise and efficient owner-manager are not at all the same thing. Hav-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 498.

ing accomplished a socialist revolution, the people have a long way to go before they learn their new position as the supreme and undivided owners of the entire public wealth—preparing themselves for it economically, politically and, if you like, psychologically, developing a collectivist mentality and behaviour. For a person of socialist upbringing is only someone who is concerned not just with working well himself, with his own well-being and prestige, but also with the performance of his work-mates and the work collective, and with the interests of the whole country and the working people throughout the world.

The turning of "mine" into "ours", it should be remembered, is a long and multifaceted process which should not be oversimplified. Even when socialist production relations have been established once and for all, some people still preserve, and even reproduce, individualistic habits, a striving to enrich themselves at the expense of others, at the expense of society. In Marx's terminology, all this is a consequence of the alienation of labour, and does not automatically and suddenly evaporate from people's minds, although the alienation itself has already been eliminated.

We are now well aware of all this from the practice of building socialism and communism. But there is something else we know as well: in full conformity with what Marx foresaw, wherever proletarian revolutions have been victorious, social property in the means of production has been firmly established in one form or another and has also become the main factor of the existence of socialism, its foundation and the main source of its progress.

A powerful economy developing according to a plan has been created in our country on the basis of socialist property. This economy makes it possible to set and fulfil national economic and social tasks that are large in scale and complex in content. It goes without saying that the realisation of these potentialities of ours does not take place by itself. Problems and serious difficulties arise. They may have different origins, but these origins are never connected with the essence of the social, collective property, which has been established and has proved its advantages.

On the contrary, many of the shortcomings which sometimes upset normal work in this or that area of our national economy are caused by deviations from the norms and requirements of economic life, whose keystone is socialist property in the means of production.

Take, for example, the question of economical and rational use of material, financial and labour resources. The fulfilment of the current five-year plan and the future development of our economy largely depend on the resolution of this question. When you get down to it, this is a matter of observing the necessary norm of economic management prescribed by socialist property. Its essence lies in a thrifty attitude to the property of the whole people, and in showing initiative and vigour in multiplying it. All of society has to pay for a violation of that norm, and it has the right strictly to call to account those who squander its wealth through negligence, incompetence or selfishness.

Our concerns now centre on increasing the efficiency of production and of the economy as a whole. The Party and Soviet people are deeply aware of the importance of that problem. But its practical solution is not going ahead as successfully as necessary. What is the hitch? Why are we not getting the returns we should from the huge capital investments? Why are the achievements of science and technology not being introduced into production at satisfactory rates?

Many reasons can be mentioned, of course. In the first place, we cannot fail to see that our work to improve and reorganise the economic mechanism and the forms and methods of management falls short of the requirements at the present level of the material, technical, social and spiritual development of Soviet society. That is the main thing. At the same time there are, of course, the effects of such factors as the considerable shortfall in agricultural production in the last four years, and the need to channel more and more funds and material resources to tap the fuel, energy and raw material resources in our country's northern and eastern regions.

One can repeat over and over again Marx's basic idea that appropriate forms of organisation of economic life are needed to

speed up progress of the productive forces, but things will not be set in motion until this theoretical truth is translated into the concrete language of practice. It is of paramount importance today to consider and consistently implement measures capable of giving full scope to the operation of the enormous creative forces inherent in our economy. These measures should be carefully prepared and realistic, and this means that in planning them it is necessary always to proceed from the laws governing the development of the economic system of socialism. The objective character of these laws makes it necessary to avoid any attempts to run the economy by methods alien to its nature. It is useful to recall here Lenin's warning about the danger of the naive belief of some officials that they can solve all problems "by issuing communist decrees".¹

On the other hand, it is impermissible to leave a project unfinished once we have agreed on the necessary measures and taken decisions. Everything that is decided should be carried out. This is the Leninist tradition of our Party and it is not fitting for us to depart from it.

The interests of society as a whole are the most important guide for the development of an economy based on socialist property. But it certainly does not follow from this that socialism suppresses or ignores personal or local interests, or the specific requirements of different social groups for the general weal. Not at all. As Marx and Engels stressed, "The 'idea' always disgraced itself insofar as it differed from the 'interest'".² One of the most important tasks in improving our national economic mechanism is to ensure that these interests are duly taken into account and are combined in the best possible way with the interests of the entire people and thus used as a motive force for the growth of the Soviet economy, for improving its efficiency, for raising labour productivity, and for all-round strengthening of the economic and defence might of the Soviet state.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "The New Economic Policy and the Tasks of the Political Education Departments", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1977, p. 77.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, "The Holy Family", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1975, p. 81.

The efficiency of a socialist national economy should, of course, be judged not only by purely economic criteria but also by social ones, bearing in mind the ultimate goal of social production. Under capitalism that goal is profit on capital; under socialism—as Marx proved theoretically—it is the welfare of the working people and creation of the conditions for all-round development of the individual. Existing socialism gives this proposition of Marx flesh and blood.

Indeed, however multifaceted the tasks confronting the Soviet economy, in the final analysis they all merge into one: to ensure the growth of the working people's well-being and create the material conditions for further flowering of their intellectual, cultural life and their active participation in the affairs of society. That is what determines the general direction of the CPSU's economic policy and it is reflected in the documents of the Party's 26th Congress, in the Food Programme now being carried out, and in the Party decisions on concrete economic matters. It is clear that this also determines many, very many, things in our approach to the rationalisation of production, to its intensification. In other words, in our country the problems of raising economic efficiency are decided in the interests of the working people, and not at their expense. This does not make our work any simpler but it allows us to conduct it relying on the inexhaustible strength, knowledge and creative energies of the entire Soviet people.

Marx saw the historical mission of the system that replaces capitalism to lie in turning work from an unpleasant and compulsory duty into the primary vital need of the individual. We now know from experience how much needs to be done on the long road to complete realisation of this idea. But we have already completed the decisive stage. An end has been put to the situation, inherent in capitalism, where the product of labour is opposed to the worker as an alien and even inimical object and where the greater the physical and mental efforts he exerts, the more powerful his oppressors become. The most significant and indisputable gain of socialism is that it has created the conditions that ensure everyone the right to work. It is work, conscious and

conscientious work, work done with initiative, work for the benefit of society, that is recognised in our society as the highest gauge of a person's merit and public prestige.

Practice has also demonstrated that socialisation of the means and objects of production is a necessary and effective factor for the formation of the social climate inherent in socialism, a climate in which man does not have an oppressive feeling of uncertainty about the morrow, a climate in which the collectivist spirit and comradely mutual assistance, moral health and social optimism are prevalent. All this taken together means a fundamentally new quality of life for the working masses, a quality which is not by any means reducible to material comfort but encompasses the entire spectrum of a flourishing life.

Naturally, all this cannot be achieved overnight, the very next day after social property has been established. It therefore cannot be assessed immediately as a "completed", accomplished socialism. A change in property relations does not by itself remove all the negative features of human relationships that have accumulated over the centuries. The fact is that without such a change any "model" of socialism, however attractively clothed, will prove unviable and will exist only in the imagination of its architects. This is axiom of Marxism, and it holds true today as it did a hundred years ago.

The so-called axioms of Marxism should be approached with care since life itself inflicts severe punishment if they are misunderstood or ignored. For example, it was at the cost of great efforts, and even mistakes, that the full significance of Marx's views concerning distribution came to be appreciated. He persistently pointed out that in the first phase of communism every working man "receives back from society—after the deductions have been made—exactly what he gives to it", in short, strictly according to the amount and quality of his work,¹ that is, in keep-

¹ See K. Marx, F. Engels, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 17.

ing with the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." An irreproachable democrat and humanist, Marx was a strong opponent of levelling and categorically rejected the demagogic or naive talk, not infrequent in his time, too, about socialism as "universal equality" in distribution and consumption.

Today not only the social and economic significance but also the tremendous political weight of these views of the founder of scientific communism have become clear from practice, from the experience of many socialist countries. Indeed, relations of distribution directly and immediately affect the interests of everyone without exception. The nature of distribution is essentially one of the major indicators of the degree of social equality possible under socialism. Any attempts to exceed this possible degree at will, to lunge ahead—to communist forms of distribution—without accurately assessing the labour contribution made by each person to the creation of the material and spiritual wealth can, and do, give rise to undesirable phenomena.

Thus, it became quite clear that any violation of the objective economic requirement for a priority growth of labour productivity is inadmissible. While producing a favourable impression at first, a wage increase if it is not inseparably linked up with this decisive factor eventually has a negative effect on the whole of economic life. Specifically, it stimulates demands which cannot be fully satisfied at the given level of production and hampers steps to eliminate shortages with all their ugly consequences, justly resented by the working people.

Certainly, correct solution of the problems of distribution under socialism presupposes that the money the population has should be matched by adequate amounts of varied consumer goods and services, the determining factor being the level of development of the productive forces. It is, of course, impossible to satisfy requirements that exceed our possibilities. At the same time it has been and will continue to be our duty to work in two directions: first, to ensure the steady growth of social production and, on this basis, a rise in the Soviet people's living standards and

cultural level; and second, to promote in every way a rise in the level of their material and cultural requirements.

Full social equality does not come overnight and in a finished form. It takes society quite a long time, and requires great efforts, to reach that stage of maturity, to work up to it. Society must develop its productive forces to the level of the material and technical basis of communism. It must cultivate in every working man high consciousness and culture, professionalism and the ability to make rational use of the benefits of socialism.

As long as such conditions are absent, the Party guiding the socialist society has to focus attention on the distribution relations, on strict control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption. The CPSU constantly sees to it that the principle of socialist distribution revealed by Marx is implemented everywhere and without fail, and that it is better and more fully applied. If this principle is violated we have to face unearned incomes, so-called rolling stones, shirkers, slackers, and bad workmen who in effect sponge on society and live off the mass of conscientious workers. This is something which must not be tolerated; it is like living parasitically on the humanism of our system.

It is work and work alone, its actual results and not somebody's subjective desire or goodwill, which should determine the level of material well-being of every citizen. This approach is fully in keeping with the spirit and letter of Marx's views concerning distribution under socialism.

We have a long-established system of material and moral work incentives. It has been serving us quite well in the building of socialism and communism. But today, both this system itself and its forms and practical application evidently need to be further improved. It is not only important to reward good work and give it the public recognition it deserves. It is also necessary that the practice of material and moral incentives, combined with an efficient organisation of labour, should maintain and develop in people's minds an awareness that their efforts and the goods they produce are useful and necessary. It is necessary that this practice should eventually instil in the workers a feeling of involvement in the activities and plans of their collective, and of the entire

people. And this feeling mobilises and disciplines better than any persuasion and exhortation.

In improving the distribution relations it is necessary to take into account the whole set of relationships involved in the work process. What is meant here is, first of all, the consistent consolidation in all spheres of the national economy of what Marx described as "regulation and order", which he considered to be forms of "social stability" of "a corresponding mode of production".¹ Administration by mere injunction and fuss and talk instead of action are especially harmful for work in this direction. A manager will not achieve much if he fails to realise this and if he tries to replace systematic and persistent organisational efforts by showy but ineffective campaigns. The purpose of the Party's efforts to improve management and raise the level of organisation, efficiency, and discipline in matters of planning, and state and labour discipline, is not only to get rid of certain shortcomings and difficulties—which by itself is extremely important—but, in the long run, to strengthen still further the foundations of the socialist way of life.

It goes without saying that in these matters the Party proceeds from the real conditions of labour management existing at the present stage of development of Soviet society. So far these conditions are such that the economic law which Marx considered the first law of communal production—the law of economy of labour time—is not yet operating here to the full. This is largely due to the great number of physically taxing, unattractive and monotonous jobs, and the slow rate at which they are being mechanised, let alone automated.

Meanwhile, it is enough to see how stretched the labour resources are and to see the demographic situation in the country for it to become clear that it is impermissible from an economic point of view to maintain the considerable share of manual, non-mechanised labour, which stands at 40 per cent in industry alone. This is why it is so meaningful today to accelerate scientific and

¹ See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, p. 793.

technological progress to the utmost, more actively to use its achievements, first of all in those sections where labour expenditure is particularly high. And we do have the foundation for this. In the high level of the development of the socialist national economy. In the professional experience and skill of the Soviet working class. In the competent economic specialists and managers, a great scientific and intellectual potential whose productive force is becoming more and more significant in today's conditions. What is necessary now is to use all our potentialities better and faster, and to improve work efficiency and production organisation.

We must persistently tackle the tasks of mechanisation and automation of production because of their social and political significance as well. As a rule, people freed from strenuous, arduous manual labour show greater initiative and a more responsible attitude to their work. They get additional possibilities for study and recreation and participation in social activity and production management. They can thus also more fully exercise the political and democratic rights granted to the working people by the socialist revolution—the rights of full masters of their society and their state.

Long before the society replacing capitalism began to emerge, Marx revealed the essence of the political forms of its life. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* noted that “the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy”.¹ The establishment of socialism is inconceivable without a firm political power, whose class content Marx summed up with the notion of “the dictatorship of the proletariat”. According to Marx's teaching, it is this dictatorship which opens the road of political development ultimately leading to communist social self-government.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 504.

How does socialism's living history compare with these predictions by Marx?

In our country, just as in all the others where the working class and working people wield power, this has meant the triumph of democracy in the most precise and literal sense of the word—the genuine victory of people's power. The working people at last have the rights and freedoms which capitalism has always denied them, in essence, if not always formally.

Soviet democracy, which came up against particularly fierce resistance from counter-revolutionary forces, both internal and external, came into being honestly, without concealing its class character, not stopping short at legalising the privileges of the working people in relation to the members of the exploiter classes, who were fighting against the new power. Soviet democracy is and will always be in essence a democracy guaranteeing the broadest rights and protecting the working people's interest, a democracy prepared to discipline those who threaten the socialist gains of the people.

In the process of building the new society, the content of socialist democracy is enriched, the restrictions formed historically wither away, and the forms of exercising the people's power become more varied. This process goes on in inseparable connection with the development of the socialist statehood, which itself undergoes qualitative changes, the most important of which is that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes a state of the whole people. This is a change of immense significance for the political system of socialism. It is reflected in the USSR Constitution adopted by the whole people in 1977, a constitution which lays the legislative basis for the further deepening of socialist democracy.

We do not idealise what has been and is being done in our country in this area. Soviet democracy has been experiencing and, it is to be supposed, is still going to experience, growing pains caused by society's material possibilities, the level of consciousness and political maturity of the masses, and also by the fact that our society is not developing in a hothouse, in isolation from the world hostile to us, but in the cold winds of the "psychological war" unlea-

shed by imperialism. Improvement of our democracy requires the elimination of bureaucratic "overorganisation" and formalism, of everything which dampens and undermines the initiative of the masses, shackles creative thinking and the activity of the working people. We have been fighting against these phenomena and will continue to do so with still greater energy and persistence.

It is sometimes claimed that the present character of socialist statehood and democracy is not in keeping with the perspective of communist self-government indicated by Marx. However, the road we have covered and the experience we have gained prove otherwise.

Take, for instance, Marx's ideas that it is the task of "the people, constituted in Communes" to govern the new society, that the essence of the new power is "a government of the people by the people".¹ It is well known that these ideas were suggested by life, by the heroic feat of the Paris Communards. Nevertheless, they contained only a very general indication of a remote goal. It is only the revolutionary creativity of the masses that could concretise the means of nearing this goal. And on the eve of the October Revolution, the creativity of the masses provided the material which enabled Lenin to outline the practical step towards realisation of Marx's formulas in the conditions of our country: "*The people themselves, . . . united in the Soviets, must run the state.*"²

People who know no other power over them but the power of their own unity—this idea of Marx, Engels and Lenin is embodied in the activity of the Soviets, combining legislation, administration and control. It is manifested in the work of the trade unions and other public organisations, in the life of the work collectives and in the development of the entire political system of our society. And the point is not at all to seek distinctions be-

¹ See K. Marx, "The Civil War in France", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, 1977, pp. 221, 227.

² V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Soldiers of Izmajlovsky Regiment, April 10 (23), 1917", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 1977, pp. 107-08.

tween this system and the ideal of communist self-government (many such distinctions can be pointed out because of the historical distance separating us from the second phase of communism). What is much more important is that this system is functioning and is perfecting itself, finding ever new forms and methods to develop democracy, to widen the working man's economic rights and potentialities in production and in the entire socio-political practice—from the deputies' commissions and people's control to the standing production meetings. This is real socialist self-government of the people which is developing in the course of communist construction.

The experience of democratic development in accordance with the USSR's new Constitution needs to be given special attention and generalised. This applies first of all to the invigoration and ever wider encouragement of local initiative, and to the deeper involvement of all work collectives in our national affairs. The powers of the local Soviets with regard to the enterprises, institutions and organisations situated in the areas under their jurisdiction have widened substantially in recent years. The potentialities of the district, regional, territorial and republican (Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics) Soviets will also increase with the implementation of the decisions of the May (1982) Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on the setting up of agroindustrial amalgamations under their authority. In this way the role of the representative organs in the exercise of the principal, managerial and organising, function of the socialist state is growing. One cannot but note the cost-accounting team, a primary form of production management evolved by the masses.

It goes without saying that an interpretation of self-government which leans towards anarcho-syndicalism, the splitting of society into rival corporations independent of each other, democracy without discipline, and the notion of rights without duties is deeply alien to us. The proven organisational principle of the entire life of socialist society is democratic centralism, which makes it possible successfully to combine the free creativity of the masses with the advantages of an integrated system of scientific guidance, planning and management.

The socialist system makes the exercise of the working people's collective rights and duties the mainspring of social progress, while by no means disregarding the interests of the individual. Our Constitution grants Soviet citizens broad rights and freedoms and at the same time underscores the priority of public interests, which it is the supreme manifestation of civic duty to serve.

The gap existing under capitalism between the interests of the state and of the citizen has been eliminated in our society. But, unfortunately, there are still people who try to oppose their selfish interests to the interests of society, of its other members. It is becoming clear that it is necessary to educate, sometimes to re-educate, some persons, and to combat encroachments on socialist law and order and on norms of our collectivist life. And this is not "flouting of human rights", on which bourgeois propaganda hypocritically harps, but real humanism and democracy, which mean government by the will of the majority and in the interests of all the working people.

The CPSU places the interests of the people, the interests of society as a whole, above everything else. It devotes day-to-day attention to providing conditions that stimulate the creative activities and social activeness of the working people, and give the industrial enterprises and the state farms and collective farms more independence. This activeness, this initiative, is a matter of the feasibility of the Party's plans, the growth of its strength and, in the final analysis, a guarantee that the programme of communist construction will be implemented.

As the nucleus of Soviet society's political system, the Party sets an example of democratic organisation of all its activities: it elaborates and develops democratic principles, which enter all the spheres of our socialist life. This is one of the most important manifestations of the Party's guiding role in the life of society, its inspiring influence on the masses.

In his time, while analysing the Marxian methodological approach to defining the main features of the new society, Lenin

wrote: "There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in the idle guess-work about what cannot be known. . . . Instead of scholastically invented, 'concocted' definitions and fruitless disputes over words (What is socialism? What is communism?), Marx gives an analysis of what might be called the stages of the economic maturity of communism."¹ It is on the basis of such an analysis that Marx, as is well known, created his teaching of the two stages in the development of the single communist formation, a teaching which the CPSU and other fraternal parties use. It is on this basis that Lenin generalised the new historical experience and comprehensively developed the theory of the construction of socialism and communism. Today, too, we use these propositions as our point of departure in resolving one of the questions which Marx, Engels and Lenin considered the most difficult—that of the concrete forms of transition to communism.

The most important features of present-day Soviet society are reflected in the concept of developed socialism. This concept convincingly shows the dialectical unity of real successes in socialist construction, in the carrying out of the many economic, social and cultural tasks of the first phase of communism, the growing sprouts of a communist future, and the problems outstanding from yesterday. This means that it will take some time to make up the lag and move ahead. We must have a sober idea of where we are. To run ahead means to put forward unfeasible tasks; to be content with what has been achieved means to fail to use everything at our disposal. What is now required is to see the real pattern of our society's growth, with all its potentialities and needs.

In reviewing what had been done in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory in recent years, the 26th Congress of the CPSU gave prominence to the elaboration of the concept of developed socialism. Relying on this concept, the Party determined its strategy and tactics for the coming years and for the more distant future,

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1977, pp. 463, 476.

and warned against possible exaggerations of the extent to which our country has neared the highest phase of communism. All this enabled us to clarify and concretise how and when we can attain our programmatic aims.

Tasks of great magnitude are arising before the Party and the people in the closing decades of the 20th century. Taken together, these tasks are reducible to what could be described as the perfecting of developed socialism, in the course of which the gradual transition to communism will take place. Our country is at the beginning of this long historical stage, which, in turn, will naturally have its own periods and its stages of growth. Only experience and practice will show how long they will last and what concrete forms they will take. But one of the major, one could say, qualitative reference points on this road was clearly indicated by the Party's 26th Congress, which put forward a proposition on the formation of a basically classless structure of society within the historical framework of developed socialism.

It is characteristic that this conclusion, made on the basis of practice, echoes Marx's understanding of socialism as a society which knows no class differences.¹ This, by the way, is fresh confirmation of the fact that the validity of Marx's views should be judged not on the basis of the experience of the last few decades but should also be assessed from the positions of a longer perspective.

The person who asks himself, "What is socialism?" and turns for the answer first of all to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is doing the right thing. But he should not stop there. Today the concept "socialism" cannot be fully understood without taking into account the very rich practical experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries. This experience shows that many of the problems arising on the road of socialist construction are complicated. But it also testifies to the fact that only socialism is able to solve the most difficult questions of social reality.

¹ See K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 18.

It is socialism that removes the age-old barriers separating labour and culture and creates a very firm alliance of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, of all manual and mental workers, with the working class playing the leading role. It brings the achievements of science, technology, literature and art within the reach of the working masses and ensures unprecedented public recognition of the creative activities of the intelligentsia. It is socialism that rallies into a close-knit family the peoples that were formerly divided by national strife and provides a just solution to the nationalities question, which is engendered by the exploiter system. It is socialism that, while facilitating the flourishing of the national forms of life, also creates a new type of international, interstate relations, which exclude inequality and are based on fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance.

With the completion of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and with the consolidation of the new, socialist way of life, the sharpest social confrontations in society are overcome, confrontations which are based, in the final analysis, on society's division into hostile classes. However, this conclusion has nothing in common with the simplistic and politically naive idea that socialism gets rid of every single contradiction and difference and of all trouble in everyday life. Incidentally, our ideological opponents also exploit this idea in their own way when they cast aspersions on the new system, pointing out that here, too, there are both difficulties and disappointments in people's lives and sometimes a very difficult struggle between the new and the old.

Yes, we have both contradictions and difficulties. To think there can be some other course of development would mean turning aside from the reliable, though sometimes rough, ground of reality, would mean departing from the ABC of Marxist dialectics. Lenin elucidated this question theoretically on the basis of the Marxist teaching. "Antagonism and contradiction," he wrote, "are not at all one and the same thing. The former will disappear, the latter will remain under socialism."¹ Now this tenet has been confirmed by practice. It does not follow from this, however,

¹ *Lenin Miscellany XI*, p. 357 (Russ. ed.).

that one can disregard or ignore non-antagonistic contradictions in politics. Life teaches us that even those contradictions which are not by their nature antagonistic can cause serious collisions if disregarded. Another—and the most important—aspect of the matter is correct use of socialism's contradictions as a source and stimulus of its onward development.

Our experience shows that successes in socialist construction come when the policy of the ruling Communist Party rests on a sound scientific foundation. Any underestimation of the role of Marxist-Leninist science and its creative development, any narrow pragmatic interpretation of its aims or disregard of the fundamental problems of theory, any imposition of opportunistic demands or scholastic theoretising can have serious political and ideological consequences. Experience and practice have repeatedly confirmed that Lenin was right in saying that "anybody who tackles partial problems without having previously settled general problems, will inevitably and at every step 'come up against' those general problems without himself realising it. To come up against them blindly in every individual case means to doom one's politics to the worst vacillation and lack of principle".¹

The CPSU attaches great significance to development of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, as its very creative essence demands. This is vitally important in solving our practical tasks. For example, we increasingly feel the need for serious research into the political economy of socialism. And here Marx's *Capital* has always set our science a shining example of deep insight into the essence of the phenomena of economic life.

The multifaceted and not always identical experience of the fraternal socialist countries provides vast material for theoretical interpretation. In this connection one cannot but recall Lenin's words to the effect that "only by a series of attempts—each of which, taken by itself, will be one-sided and will suffer from certain inconsistencies—will complete socialism be created by the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties", *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, 1977, p. 489.

revolutionary co-operation of the proletarians of *all* countries".¹ Nowadays the task is being tackled in practice over vast areas of the globe, in the framework of the world system of socialism, which has become the decisive factor of mankind's social progress. And it is being tackled in the basic direction foreseen by Marx.

Lenin often said that he constantly collated all his activities with Marx. It is with Marx, Engels and Lenin that the CPSU collates its every step.

To collate current activities with Marx, with Marxism-Leninism, does not at all mean mechanically to "compare" life in progress with this or that formula. We would be worthless followers of our teachers if we were content simply to repeat the truths they discovered and rely on the magic power of quotations once learnt by heart.

Marxism is not a dogma but an effective guide to action, to independent work on the complex tasks which every new turn in history sets before us. And to be able to keep pace with life, the Communists should carry forward and enrich the teaching of Marx in all directions, and creatively apply in practice his method of materialist dialectics, which is justifiably described as the living soul of Marxism. It is this attitude to our invaluable ideological heritage, an example of which Lenin set, and this continuous self-renewal of revolutionary theory under the impact of revolutionary practice that make Marxism the real science and art of revolutionary creativity. In this lies the secret of the force of Marxism-Leninism, its unfading freshness.

It is sometimes said that the new phenomena in social life "do not fit in" with the concept of Marxism-Leninism, that it is in "crisis" and should be "revived" with ideas drawn from Western sociology, philosophy or political science. The problem, however, is not at all an alleged "crisis" of Marxism; it is something else—the inability of some self-styled Marxist theorists to appre-

¹ V. I. Lenin, " 'Left-wing' Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 346.

ciate the true scope of the theoretical thinking of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and to use the tremendous intellectual power of their teaching when making a concrete study of concrete questions. It would not be superfluous to add that many bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and political economists have earned a name for themselves largely by twisting Marxist ideas to suit themselves.

It is unworthy of Communists to be attracted by the trenchant phrases of all sorts of "perfectors" of Marxism and to clutch at the fabrications of bourgeois science. Not the erosion of the Marxist-Leninist teaching but, on the contrary, a struggle for its purity and creative development—such is the path to the cognition and solution of new problems. Only this approach is in keeping with the traditions and spirit of our teaching and the requirements of the communist movement.

We, the Soviet Communists, are proud of belonging to Marxism-Leninism, the most influential ideological current in the entire history of world civilisation. Open to all the best and most advanced in modern science and culture, today it is in the centre of the world's intellectual life, it has won the minds of millions upon millions of people. It is the ideological credo of the rising class, which is liberating all of mankind. It is the philosophy of social optimism, the philosophy of the present and the future.

The world has now travelled a long distance along the road of its social renewal, along the road of realisation of the revolutionary goals and ideals of the working class. The political map of the world has taken on a new appearance. Science has made momentous discoveries; the technological advances are astounding. At the same time, mankind has many new problems, including some very complicated ones. Its concern about the worsening raw materials, energy, food, ecological and other global problems is valid. And the main thing of concern to the peoples today is the need to preserve peace, to avert a thermonuclear catastrophe. There is nothing more important than this on the international plane for our Party, the Soviet Government and all the nations of the world.

To gain an understanding of all the complexities of the modern world and organise and direct the revolutionary socio-histor-

Marx's Teaching and Problems in Building of Socialism in the USSR

ical creativity of the working class and all the working people—such is the great task which the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the struggle for mankind's progress are tackling today, the task which Karl Marx set himself and his ideological and political associates and followers: to interpret and change the world.

Kommunist, No. 3, 1983

BORIS PONOMAREV

**Alternate Member
of the Political Bureau
and Secretary of the CC CPSU**

**MARX'S DOCTRINE—
A GUIDE TO ACTION**

*Speech at the meeting on the 165th birth
anniversary and centenary of the death
of Karl Marx (Moscow, 30 March 1983)*

We have come a long way from the time when Karl Marx created the doctrine which immortalised his name. We live in an epoch which, as Lenin predicted, brought this doctrine its greatest triumph. We witnessed and are witnessing far-reaching revolutionary transformations. The social and class character of many states and the condition and way of life of the majority of peoples have changed radically. Never before has mankind known change of such dimensions.

The fire-storm of two world wars swept the world in the twentieth century. But the twentieth century also saw the Great October Socialist Revolution, which abolished the order in which one ruling class replaced another, while exploitation and oppression remained. Human society made an abrupt turn towards socialism, which eliminates forever the exploitation, oppression and domination of the majority by a minority. Socialism has proven its unconquerable strength in hard-fought battles with imperialism which tried to turn back the clock of history. By routing German fascism and Japanese militarism, the first socialist country in the world helped other peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence and made a decisive contribution to the creation of favourable conditions for further worldwide progress. The revolutions in Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Demo-

cratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Vietnam, China, Korea, Cuba and Laos, along with the earlier victorious revolution in Mongolia, made socialism a world system. Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Mozambique and a few other countries have also taken the revolutionary path towards socialism.

Summarising the history of philosophical thought, Marx formulated his famous thesis: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it."¹ Inspired by the ideals of socialism, the working class, all the working people, achieved tremendous success in accomplishing this task. The thoughts and the cause of Marx and Lenin are being put into practice. Their great undertaking continues.

Why do we revere Marx? Mankind suffered endlessly from exploitation, from national and racial oppression, and from devastating wars. Marx was the first to show the social causes of these calamities. The main thing is that he discovered the material foundations and objective possibilities for ending them. His immortal achievement is that he discovered the *objective laws of society's development* and created a science of how to combat and defeat capitalism, and how to construct a new, socialist system.

—Marx gave a materialistic explanation of the motion of world history and worked out a doctrine on the development and succession of social-economic formations.

—He created the only scientifically-sound political economy and discovered the source of enrichment of the bourgeoisie, namely, surplus value, thus unravelling the secret of capitalist exploitation and proving the inevitability of capitalism's revolutionary overthrow.

—He defined the historical mission of the working class, called upon to eliminate the last of the exploiting systems and to take the lead in building socialism.

¹ K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 1976, p. 5.

—He worked out a strictly scientific, dialectical-materialist method of studying nature and society, and the methodology of the proletarian class, i.e. true, approach to the cognition of social processes and events and a genuinely realistic attitude to them.

Thanks to these epoch-making discoveries, *socialism turned from a utopia into a science.*

But Marx was much more than a brilliant scholar. He devoted all his life to making the science he had created into a means for liberating the working class. As Engels said about his great friend, "Marx was before all else a revolutionist".¹ He saw science as "a mighty lever of history, as a revolutionary force in the loftiest sense of the word".²

The combination of revolutionary thought and revolutionary practice gave birth to the *great political ideas of Marxism*, which became the decisive force behind all further world progress.

In the first place, this applies to the idea and the fundamental principles of the establishment and activity of a proletarian party, without which the working class cannot turn from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself" and for all mankind.

This applies to the theory of class struggle and of the dictatorship of the proletariat which, as the existing socialism has shown, develops into a state of the whole people and marks the beginning of the transition to a classless society.

This applies to the discovery of the social essence and the causes of wars and revolutions.

This applies to the idea of alliance between the working class and the peasantry and other strata of the working people.

This applies to the conclusion concerning the identity of the fundamental interests of the working people of the metropolitan countries and the colonies.

¹ F. Engels, "Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 163.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 19, Berlin. 1962. S. 333.

This applies to the scientific substantiation of proletarian internationalism.

This also applies to the scientific forecast about the two phases of the communist social system.

Those are only the basic ideas of Marxism, which made it a *practical weapon* in the revolutionary transformation of the world.

It is indicative that the first all-embracing theoretical document of scientific socialism—the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*—originated as a programme of revolutionary action. With brilliant perspicacity and in a form magnificent for its forceful impact and beauty, Marx and Engels for the first time gave a full and comprehensive summary of the proletarian ideology. The *Manifesto*, rightly called the song of songs of Marxism, laid the indestructible foundation of the revolutionary doctrine of the working class for ages ahead. It is by all rights the handbook of every Communist, every conscious revolutionary to this day.

In the new era Lenin's genius raised scientific socialism to a new height. The ability for creative development, which is essentially lodged in it, has been irrefutably proven by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the fraternal communist parties. As a result, the entire social development is increasingly influenced by the ever-living teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

As a science, Marxism-Leninism is universal. Philosophy, political economy and the theory of struggle for socialism and communism are fused in it like in an alloy. It has stood up to the most difficult but also the most effective test—the test of more than a century of *practice*. It has triumphed over dozens of other theories and concepts, which have been rejected because they cannot compete with it either in explaining, let alone changing, the world. It is a correct, and for this reason life-asserting, optimistic teaching.

History developed, develops and will develop according to the ideas of Marx and Lenin!

**I. "The General Universal
Struggle Between Capital
and Labour Is of a 'Cosmopolitan
Character'..."**

(Marx)

The social revolutions that have shaken the world have resulted in a steady shrinking of the sphere of capitalist domination. But the capitalist system is still extant in a considerable section of the world, and a large portion of mankind is still enduring its oppression. This cannot be overlooked in politics.

What is happening to capitalism in our time can be neither understood nor correctly assessed without reference to Marx and to his *Capital*, the principal work of his life. Lenin's theory of imperialism is a direct creative extension of Marx's economic theory. Lenin proved that at this last stage of capitalism all objective conditions are being created for transition to socialism and that mankind comes hard up to the need for fundamental revolutionary change.

The opponents of socialism, who prattle about the "obsolescence" of Marxism-Leninism, tend to refer to the new phenomena characteristic of present-day capitalism. Yes, the capitalism of the end of the 20th century is different in many respects. Its evolution reflects the enormous growth of the productive forces and the socialisation of labour, the collapse of colonial empires and the major gains of the working-class and the democratic movement. Certainly, the capitalist system is affected by the many-sided and strong impact of existing socialism, which keeps growing and gaining strength. Capitalism has forever lost the ability to rule the destinies of peoples. It is compelled to adapt itself. The main forms of such adaptation are state intervention in the economy to the point of direct regulation, use of the achievements of modern science and technology, further internationalisation of capital and integration, growth of transnational monopolies, and efforts to coordinate the economic policy of the capitalist states.

Capitalism has succeeded in prolonging its existence. But this

has cost and continues to cost the peoples very, very dearly. More, it has created a threat to life on earth.

Still, the "old mole of history", as Marx figuratively described the processes paving the way to revolution, continues its work, because the nature of capitalism, the substance of its basic contradictions, has not changed, and because its social evils are accumulating and increasing.

Far from disappearing, the exploitation of the working class and all the working people *is growing more intensive*. In the capitalist zone, we see an ever sharpening antagonism between capital and labour, between monopolies and the mass of the people, between imperialism and the developing countries.

Far from being overcome, the imperialist contradictions *are growing deeper*. We see rivalry between individual countries and between the main centres of imperialism (the USA, Western Europe and Japan) develop into trade wars, into pitched battles for markets and sources of raw materials.

Far from ending, economic crises *are indeed ever more frequent*. Marx's prediction on this score has been fully borne out. Life has dispelled the illusions about a "flourishing" and "crisis-free" capitalism. The capitalist world is already in its third economic crisis since the early 1970s. In the industrially developed capitalist countries alone there are now over 30 million unemployed doomed to great hardships, privations and moral suffering. The new technological restructuring of the capitalist economy threatens a variety of disasters, an aggravation of all contradictions that may well end in a crisis far graver than in the 1930s.

Far from narrowing, the gap *has widened* between wealth and poverty, between the majority of the population and a handful of multimillionaires. This is an inevitable result of the general law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx. In the USA corporate profits went up by 50 per cent in the 1970s, whereas workers' real wages went down by almost one-fifth. At the top of US society each of the 4,500 super-rich people has an annual income of more than one million dollars. In contrast, 32 million

people—14 per cent of the population!—live below the official poverty line.

Far from decreasing, the contradictions of the capitalist use of scientific and technical progress *keep growing*. Here one cannot help recalling the scathing remark of Marx who noted that progress under capitalism, the invention of new machines lead to exhaustion, unemployment and poverty—that the triumphs of machinery seem bought “by the loss of character”.¹ To prolong its rule, modern capitalism has been using the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution primarily for the development of weapons capable of destroying mankind. To use Marx’s words, it truly becomes more and more like “that hideous, pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain”.²

Whatever aspect of bourgeois society you may take—everywhere you will see signs of its general crisis. To the cyclical crises are now added a number of structural ones, such as the raw materials, energy and food crises. Constant inflation, upheavals in the credit, financial and monetary fields, speak of a chronic malaise of capitalism. Unbridled militarism and the arms race are having especially heavy consequences. What we see is a spiritual, moral decline—disunity of people, loneliness, growth of suicides, drug addiction, crime and terrorism.

Even many Western personalities admit that capitalism is a sick society. They argue about the diagnosis and methods of treatment. But the diagnosis is on hand—it was made by Marx. A social system that subordinates everything to the cult of money, to the profit motive, is incurable.

History has completely borne out Marx’s ideas *about the historical mission of the working class*, which has demonstrated its ability to put an end to the system of capitalist exploitation, to head the struggle of the peoples for freedom and equality, and to secure the victory of socialism.

¹ K. Marx, “Speech at the Anniversary of the *People’s Paper*”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, 1980, p. 655.

² K. Marx, “The Future Results of British Rule in India”, *op. cit.*, Vol. 12, 1979, p. 222.

In the past century and a half, the working class has grown immeasurably, and first of all numerically. In Marx's time, it numbered some 10 million. Now it exists in all countries and on all continents, and exceeds 700 million.

It has changed immensely in quality. In a number of countries it has become the ruling class and is developing as a socialist working class. Even in the capitalist part of the world, its position, composition and very image have also seen major change. More and more population groups are turning proletarian and joining the working class. Its allies, close to the workers in social standing, are more numerous.

As a result, the political influence of the working class continues to grow. From the workers comes the sense of need for fundamental change, and faith in socialism as the only way to salvation from the faults and wrongs of capitalist society.

The modern bourgeoisie has come to see the power of the working class. It is doing everything to erode and roll back the labour movement, and isolate its advanced contingents from the masses. And sometimes its efforts leave a trace. But, in spite of everything, the struggle between labour and capital is intensifying. The calamities of the increasing crisis are evoking mass protest. The working people reply to the offensive of monopolies and governments in the proletarian way: by strikes, demonstrations, and sit-ins. That is the granite logic of the class struggle. Its rising tide will not be halted by reprisals or anti-communist demagoguery, by water cannons and tear gas, or police truncheons.

For thousands of years, pharaohs and emperors, kaisers and tsars, presidents and other rulers have been trying to prevent social change. But all these attempts have invariably failed because what matured in the womb of society and was conditioned by the objective course of history is inevitable. Its inexorable advance turns into pygmies those who curse communism, who see behind socialism, revolutions, and liberation movements the "hand of Moscow" and seek to counter them with imperialist diktat and "crusades". Revolutions, as Lenin pointed out, "break

out when tens of millions of people come to the conclusion that it is impossible to live in the old way any longer".¹

This objective law has been strikingly borne out by all the revolutionary developments of the 20th century. It has also been confirmed by the *anti-colonial revolutions* of our time which Marx predicted as inevitable. There are scores of independent states today on the vast expanses of former empires. Scientific socialism, which its opponents pictured as a "purely European" thing, is becoming an increasingly notable factor of social change in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The struggle to overcome the age-old backwardness caused by the colonialists, and to fight off imperialist encroachments on the right of the peoples to build life as they want it is an important element of the world revolutionary process.

Marx's ideas about *the role of Communists*, proletarian parties, and the communist movement in the revolutionary remaking of society have proved right. His doctrine holds the key part in Marxism-Leninism. It runs through all its major components—from philosophic to purely political and tactical. Scientific socialism as a theory was created in direct connection with the formation of the first genuinely proletarian party.

The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and other Party documents, and the numerous articles and letters connected with the experience and work of the Communist League, the First International, and the first socialist parties of Europe, and the activities of Marx and Engels as party leaders, contain the essential principles and ideas for the building of working-class parties. Lenin followed them in creating his *great science of a new type of party*. They belong among the chief assets of the world communist movement.

Nowadays, communist parties are active in nearly a hundred countries. Many of them have become ruling parties and some have developed into mass parties. Communists are now a force on a truly global scale. They total upwards of 70 million, not

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Fourth Conference of Trade Unions and Factory Committees of Moscow, June 27-July 2, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 480.

just a few hundred as they were in Marx's day. But the magnitude and complexity of the tasks facing the Communists, like their responsibility for using the entire modern revolutionary potential, have likewise increased immeasurably. And in this context, the following idea of Marx is as true today as it was in his lifetime, namely: "...Even under the most favourable political conditions all serious success of the proletariat depends upon the organisation that unites and concentrates its forces."¹

Loyalty to the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin is basic to the success of the communist parties in carrying out their role as the most advanced political force of modern times. The history of the struggle for socialism down the decades has shown that only parties which are faithful to Marxism-Leninism, which firmly uphold it, and which translate it into practice with due regard for the particular conditions of their respective countries, can score victories benefiting the working class and the mass of the people. Any departure from Marxism-Leninism or its revision are always fraught, in the long run, with grave consequences for the working-class movement of the country concerned and for the cause of peace and socialism.

The founders of Marxism taught their followers a "genuinely international attitude"² and called on them to cherish the principle of the internationalism of the working-class movement. At the present stage of the acute class confrontation in the world arena this is particularly essential. It is more than clear that the more consistent every communist party is in following Marx's appeal to the advanced workers of the world "to stand firmly by each other",³ the surer and more dependable will its success be in resolving its own internal problems.

¹ "The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association", in *The General Council of the First International, 1866-1868*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 329.

² "Engels to August Bebel, March 18-28, 1875", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 273.

³ K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", in *The General Council of the First International, 1864-1866*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 286.

**II. "...A Community
of Free Individuals,
Carrying on Their Work
with the Means of Production
in Common..."**

(Marx)

The central conclusion to be drawn from Marx's doctrine is that the victory of socialism and communism is inevitable. We can be proud that the first triumphant socialist revolution took place in this country and that the Russian proletariat, led by the Party of Lenin, paved the way to socialism for mankind.

It should be stressed that Marx and Engels, who had closely followed the situation in Russia, had anticipated that it may play a worldwide revolutionary role and that a Russian revolution may be a "signal for a proletarian revolution in the West".¹

Of crucial importance for the victory of our people in the struggle for socialism was the Party's creative development and skilled application of the revolutionary science established by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The ideas advanced by Marx and turned into an integral theory by Lenin lay at the root of the construction of socialism in the USSR. This applies, first of all, to the establishment of a state of an entirely new, socialist type; defence of the gains of the revolution, and, most important of all, the radical social-economic and cultural transformation of the country by means of what Marx described as the *national centralisation of the means of production* and the organisation of work "on a common and rational plan".²

Marx and Engels saw one of the main tasks of the proletariat once it came to power in increasing "the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible".³ Indeed, the first socialist country

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "Preface to the Russian Edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*", *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 12.

² K. Marx, "The Nationalization of the Land", *The International Herald*, No. 11, June 15, 1872.

³ K. Marx, F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 504.

astounded the world by becoming one of the biggest industrial powers in so short a time. The high rates of economic growth are characteristic of the majority of the countries of the socialist system. Between 1950 and 1980 industrial production in the CMEA member-countries increased almost 13 times over as against less than 4 times over in the developed capitalist countries.

Marx believed that the future builders of socialism should without fail have a "realistic outlook"¹ of the specific tasks at every given stage of development. Our Party follows this approach. Indeed, it is reflected in the article, "Karl Marx's Teaching and Some of the Problems in the Building of Socialism in the USSR", of Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The article elicited the tremendous interest and won the approval of the Soviet people, the other socialist countries, and was extensively commented upon on an international scale as an example of the creative utilisation of Marx's legacy for the theoretical analysis and the practical presentation of problems connected with the consolidation and perfection of socialism. "It is of paramount importance today," the article stresses, in particular, "to consider and consistently implement measures capable of giving full scope to the operation of the enormous creative forces inherent in our economy. These measures should be carefully prepared and realistic, and this means that in planning them it is necessary always to proceed from the laws governing the development of the economic system of socialism. The objective character of these laws makes it necessary to avoid any attempts to run the economy by methods alien to its nature."²

At the current stage, the strategy of the Party is to thoroughly perfect the developed socialist society on the basis of the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU. Prime importance now attaches to specific programmes and practical measures to over-

¹ K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 19.

² See this book, p. 18.

come bottlenecks and difficulties, and to eliminate shortcomings so as to further reinforce the foundations of the socialist way of life. This is the aim of the decisions passed by the November 1982 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. A great deal has already been done to carry out these decisions. All of us can see that the Central Committee, the Politburo, all Party organisations have launched a major drive in the cardinal sectors of the country's development. The facts confirm time and again that the CPSU draws its strength from its profound and inviolable ties with the people and that it has no other concern but the interests and requirements of the people.

Setting new targets and mobilising the energy of the working people, the Party persistently continues to assert the Leninist style in all its work. This style combines the scientific soundness of its decisions with efficiency, realism and self-criticism; intensive activity and initiative with strict control of the final results and with intolerance of any deviations from Party morality and discipline. It combines the ability to look far ahead and to think on a large scale with a constant orientation on concrete practical tasks. The Leninist style provides for the promotion to the governing posts of politically mature and competent persons with a sober view of things and practical aptitudes, whose deep sense of commitment blends with the ability, to quote Lenin, to arrange for solid and cohesive work by a large number of people.

At the centre of the Party's work today is the *organisation of labour in the broadest sense of this term*, which would actuate all factors of economic efficiency at all levels of the national economy: from the individual work place and enterprise to the nationwide level.

The principle of an "economical economy" stands, in the final analysis, for economy of time. "Economy of time," Marx wrote, "as well as planned distribution of productive labour time over the various branches of production, therefore, remains the first economic law if communal production is taken as the basis."¹

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Moscow, 1939, p. 89.

The key role in carrying out this law at the present stage belongs to science. That is why the Party lays so much emphasis on the task of enhancing the role of science and technological progress. Here, too, we follow Marx. His idea that in socialist society science turns "from an instrument of class rule into a popular force"¹ ranks among his most perceptive predictions. So the Party directs our researchers and practitioners to doing everything they can to build up and make the fullest possible use of this "popular force" or, putting it in contemporary terms, to fuse the scientific and technological revolution with the opportunities offered by socialism.

The development of science and its introduction in industry and agriculture have great international significance as well—for the prestige of socialism and for success in the peaceful competition with capitalism. We are confident of success because, to quote Lenin, "no forces of darkness can withstand an alliance of the scientists, the proletariat and the technologists".²

Marx pointed out that the development of socialism requires unflagging attention to "the organisation of production" for "free and associated labour".³ In our country, this problem was tackled in different ways at different stages. Now, too, when the acceleration of the transition from the extensive factors of social production to the intensive methods is on the order of the day, the Party presses ahead with the drastic modernisation of management and planning and of the whole economic machinery.

In this connection the Party has raised the task of enhancing both the coordinating role of the state and the creative initiative of work collectives. Public ownership is not an abstract notion; it provides for the participation of the working people

¹ K. Marx, "Outlines of *The Civil War in France*", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 162.

² V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at the Second All-Russia Congress of Medical Workers, March 1, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1977, p. 402.

³ See K. Marx, "Outlines of *The Civil War in France*", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, p. 157.

in managing public property through their collectives and organisations. That is why the team contract has become a happy form for the utmost utilisation of our industrial potential. That is also why the Party attaches such great significance to the introduction of team contracts in agriculture. Hence the urgent need to root out all formalism and ostentation in socialist emulation.

We know that a search is underway for other methods of materialising the advantages of the public ownership of the means of production, which would meet the contemporary requirements.

The Constitution of the USSR also provides for the development of individual labour and individual subsidiary small holdings in the interests of society. This is particularly important for launching a truly nation-wide campaign for the fulfilment of the Food Programme.

It is also very important that consistent implementation of the principle of personal and collective concern and responsibility has become in all spheres of production and public life a most conspicuous trend of Soviet socialist democracy.

Only socialism creates conditions for the realisation of man's age-old dream about equality, prosperity and confidence in the future, and that work should afford real satisfaction and let man show all his abilities. Nothing can head us off the way on which, according to the founders of Marxism, "...the satisfaction of all reasonable needs will be assured to everyone in an ever-increasing measure".¹ Reasonable and no other: Marx condemned what he described as "non-human" needs, whims, fancies and luxuries, which are contrary to socialism. He also pointed out that the only source for meeting people's needs is the available productive potential. Only its expansion can make for any expansion of consumption. This is an objective economic law. And that is what the CPSU is bringing home to Soviet people in all earnest, organising effective utilisation of

¹ F. Engels, "Karl Marx", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 86.

all the potentialities and labour resources of developed socialist society.

The Party deals with the economic, social and political problems in close association with *ideological work and education*.

Nothing could be farther from Marxism than underestimating the role of ideas in the development of society. None other than Marx made the pronouncement which Lenin valued so highly: "...Theory ... becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses."¹ As we know, when Lenin was forming the Bolshevik Party, he believed that its prime task was to instil socialist ideas in the working-class movement. Today, too, it is tremendously important to strengthen and promote socialist convictions among the masses and to introduce the conclusions of scientific theory in day-to-day practice.

The experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries shows that at every new stage this calls for new and considerable effort. It is not just a question of overcoming the private-property mentality of the past thousands of years, which hostile propaganda is trying to reanimate. There are also objective difficulties and contradictions in the development of the foundation of the socialist consciousness, that is, of the social relations. The mass consciousness depends directly on the state of the relationship between society, the collective, and the individual; the leader and the executor; town and countryside; mental and physical work; the measure of work and of consumption, and so on.

The CPSU pays constant attention to the further strengthening of the alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, and to the consolidation of the social and internationalist unity of the Soviet people. These processes are gradually leading to a classless society which will, essentially and in the main, take shape already within the framework of developed socialism.

The heightening of the ideological level of the masses is now

¹ K. Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 182.

especially closely linked with the cultivation of a truly conscientious attitude to work and work habits that measure up to the needs of our time. It will also depend a great deal on our firm resolve to end violations of discipline and order, and to eliminate waste, bribery, parasitism, thievery, and all other ways of sponging on the people. As you know, the Party has launched a vigorous drive against those who violate the principles of socialism in order to rid society, as Lenin demanded, from the "vestiges of capitalism" and "idlers, parasites and embezzlers of state funds".¹ In this the Party has the support of the whole people.

The aforesaid does not at all belittle the immense independent role of ideological work which, as Marx put it, is to convert social reason into social force.²

The present stage in the country's development requires first of all a higher level and greater practical efficiency of what Marx called the sphere of spiritual production, including science, literature, art, journalism and all other forms of culture.

The Party assesses the level of ideological work at present and for the future by how successfully it cultivates and asserts the ideological and moral principles of socialism in the consciousness and behaviour of the Soviet people, helping them to take a motivated position in life and to contribute to the great common cause of building the new socialist civilisation.

The ideological potential of society is also being heightened by the improvement of the mass media on the basis of the criteria of ideological work which the Party has worked out and which it adapts and develops to suit the new needs of life.

Improving socialism in the USSR is an integral, most important part of the growth and consolidation of the positions of *the whole socialist world*. The principal features of the world community of liberated labour, which Marx and Engels had dreamed

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 251.

² See K. Marx, "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, 1977, p. 80.

of, are gradually taking shape in the socialist community, in the varied experience that is being amassed by it.

Socialism, as Marx wrote, will require international co-ordination of the social forms of production.¹ This prediction is now being realised through socialist economic integration and the new tasks which the ruling communist parties are putting forward and agreeing among themselves.

The firm international positions and the prestige of socialism are inseparable from socialist internationalism. It underlies the international relations of the new type and includes full equality, respect for each other's independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty, non-interference in each other's affairs, mutual assistance, and comradely cooperation. Having discussed the results of the recent Prague conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR stressed again that friendship and cooperation with the fraternal countries has always held and will continue to hold special priority in Soviet international policy.

The founders of scientific communism foresaw that the countries of victorious socialism would be "such [a] colossal power and provide such an example"² that other peoples will follow their lead. This was true in the past, it is true in the present, and will be so in future, because socialism is making confident headway, overcoming obstacles and difficulties, never failing to criticise itself,³ just as Marx foresaw, and casting off the obsolete, while boldly adopting and asserting the new.

¹ See K. Marx, "Outlines of *The Civil War in France*", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune*, p. 157.

² "Engels to Karl Kautsky, September 12, 1882", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 331.

³ See K. Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 1979, p. 106.

**III. "An End to Wars,
Peace among the Nations,
the Cessation of Pillaging
and Violence—Such
Is Our Ideal.."**

(Lenin)

Marx pointed out more than once that wars engendered by the rapacious nature of capitalism were the worst and most dangerous of all of its vices. Lenin had all the more reason to point out this baneful fact in the age of imperialism. Imperialist contradictions produced the two worst world wars in history. And despite the immense carnage and destruction they had caused the peoples, imperialism, notably US imperialism, is now posing the threat of yet another world war, this time a thermonuclear one.

The founders of scientific socialism determined the causes and sources of the war danger. That has played a tremendous part in organising the struggle against wars of aggression. Marx, Engels and Lenin foresaw that the development of the material means of warfare might put the problem of war and peace in an entirely different light. That is exactly what has happened after the development of nuclear weapons. They make a world war a disaster for civilisation. In our extremely responsible times, with humanity facing the question of survival, nothing is more important than to remove this threat.

The Soviet philosophy of peace reposes on the great ideals and values that have come down from the great humanists of the past and have been organically assimilated by Marxism-Leninism. The Soviet policy of peace is a thoroughly realistic one. It is based on a scientific evaluation of the consequences of nuclear war, which nothing can justify. It takes into account the relation of forces between socialism and imperialism, and their military parity. It rests on the growing moral and political potential of the countries and peoples favouring peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

"Of all the dogmas of the bigoted policy...", Marx wrote over

a hundred years ago, "none has caused more harm than the one that says 'In order to have peace, you must prepare for war'. This great truth, whose outstanding feature is that it contains a great lie, is the battle cry that has called all Europe to arms..."¹ Today, too, this great lie is shaping the policy of the US administration, which proclaims from all the rooftops that the US military buildup is serving the cause of peace. The US President has been repeating this, and saying that to be ready for war is the most effective means of keeping the peace.

In fact, however, this is impelled by the ambition to upset the military-strategic parity, to secure military superiority over the USSR, and to rob it of the ability to retaliate in the event of a nuclear aggression. The Soviet Union will never allow that to happen; it will not be unarmed in face of any threat. Yuri Andropov said so emphatically in his answers to a *Pravda* correspondent. They contain a fundamentally important exposition of our views on the pressing issues of disarmament and our assessment of the US administration's foreign policy line as being a menace to all nations, to all humanity. The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee exposed the unseemly tactics of the US administration in misrepresenting the policy of the USSR and justifying its own successive new scenarios of nuclear war.

This reckless course is based on militant, fanatical anti-communism. Only hatred of socialism and gross obscurantism can explain the absurd allegations that the founders of Marxism-Leninism "reject morality" by their class-oriented approach to it. On the contrary, the class position, which expresses the interests of the working people, of the vast majority of the world population, enables Communists to consistently uphold the universal moral values. And those who abuse the religious feelings of believers and involve the name of God to justify the arms race, those who embrace the killers of the peaceful residents of Sabra and Shatila and who exculpate the butchers of Song My, who give refuge to Nazi criminals, who encourage and arm the ter-

¹ K. Marx, "Invasion!", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, 1980, p. 439.

rorist and racist regimes in Central America and southern Africa, who inspire aggression against revolutionary Nicaragua, and who are planning "victory" in a nuclear war and cold-bloodedly estimate the hundreds of millions of victims it will entail, have no right at all to lecture to them about morality.

The vital interests of our Motherland and of the socialist community, and the need to protect the gains of socialism, oblige us to be well armed and to have powerful defences. It is appropriate to recall the following wise observation of Marx on this score: "There is something in human history like retribution; and it is a rule of historical retribution that its instrument be forged not by the offended, but by the offender himself."¹ This applies to nuclear weapons as well. When imperialism turned the great scientific breakthrough—the discovery of atomic energy—into a weapon of mass extermination, the Soviet Union came up with a counterforce to avert nuclear war and to save mankind.

But we have never considered, nor do we now consider, stock-piling of nuclear bombs and missiles as the road to peace. No, peace is best served by renouncing the use of nuclear weapons and first-strike doctrines, and by halting the arms race. That is why the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries and the constructive and realistic initiatives of Yuri Andropov have elicited such widespread response in all countries.

The ideas of universal peace and of preventing thermonuclear war are taking hold of ever growing numbers of people. The anti-war and anti-missile movement has gained tremendous scale and is of an unprecedentedly militant character. Tens of millions of people have joined this movement in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan. Today all of them are united by the common desire to uphold the main right of every nation and every individual—the right to live. More than a century ago Marx urged "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice,

¹ K. Marx, "The Indian Revolt", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *The First Indian War of Independence, 1857-1859*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, p. 79.

which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".¹ Today this appeal of the greatest of all humanists could well be inscribed on the banner of the army of the hundreds of millions of the peace champions.

The communist parties are doing everything to step up the struggle of the masses against the danger of war. Like our own Party, they stand for the broadest possible cooperation and understanding between the diverse political and social forces that are disturbed by the danger of nuclear war. The CPSU has fruitful contacts with Socialist, Social-Democratic and Labour parties in order to uphold detente and strengthen peaceful East-West relations. The Socialists and Social Democrats who head governments in seven European countries and who have the support of tens of millions of people, shoulder a great responsibility for the preservation of peace and the effective furtherance of the great anti-war tradition of the working-class movement.

We are aware of the influence of realistically-minded statesmen on international politics. In conducting its policy of peace, the Soviet Union expects that they too will display awareness of their duty to the peoples longing for peace for themselves and future generations.

Ours is a period when the danger of a world war and the forces capable of preventing it are growing at one and the same time. The CPSU takes account of this in its foreign policy and in the ideological struggle in the international arena. It will continue to expose the designs of imperialism and its tactics and to show, in words and deeds, that the Soviet Union considers nuclear war impermissible. We are against the conflict of ideas to become a confrontation between states. There is no reasonable foundation, nor can there be, for relations between states

¹ K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", in *The General Council of the First International, 1864-1866*, p. 287.

with different social systems, excepting peaceful coexistence. Such is the immutable viewpoint of our Party.

Marxism has a destiny which no other trend of social thought has ever had or will have. In the 100 years since the death of Marx, his teaching has been enriched with the tremendous experience of the international working-class movement and the revolutionary movement in general. Thanks to Lenin, a whole new period began in the development of the Marxian theory and, which is more important, in its successful application in practice. At present, scientific socialism incorporates the experience of the triumphant socialist revolutions—first of all, of course, that of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the experience of the developed socialist society in the USSR, and the experience of socialist construction in a number of other countries. For mankind, the teaching on building socialism and the really existing socialism are a priceless endowment which has asserted itself in the bitter clash with imperialism and is confidently advancing.

In our day it is impossible to study or to propagate or to defend Marxism-Leninism without taking these great and irreversible achievements into account. Indeed, they also mark a new stage in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine itself. They have proved to the working class, to all the working people of the world that the fine ideals based on the theory of scientific socialism are wholly realisable. This also largely explains the ever wider spread of socialist ideas across the world. A graphic illustration of this is the scale on which Marx is being commemorated this year in various countries on all continents. It is being generally recognised that the world would not have been what it is now if there had been no Marx and Lenin. The idea that socialism is the future for all mankind is reaching the consciousness of the broadest sections of people on our planet.

We Communists and all Soviet people necessarily turn to the great teachers' ideas in our present deeds and concerns. Let us recall what Nadezhda Krupskaya said about Lenin's attitude to Marx: "Lenin learnt from Marx to look at life intently and critically, to analyse its phenomena, and to distinguish the funda-

mental from the secondary, learnt to link theory with practice..."¹ Lenin constantly "consulted" with Marx, and looked for the answers to topical questions in Marx's works at the most difficult and crucial moments of the revolution.² "Theory enabled Ilyich to read the book of life,"³ Krupskaya said so aptly. Soviet Communists learn from Lenin how to study Marx and, at the same time, how to study Lenin himself, and how to translate their teaching into reality.

According to Lenin, Marxism "has assimilated and refashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture".⁴ Marx himself personified the attitude of principle, scientific thoroughness, honour and responsibility; he displayed high self-discipline, inexhaustible perseverance, enthusiasm and unbending willpower in the pursuit of the aim which he had set himself. That is why knowing Marx, as well as Engels and Lenin, is not only the best way to master genuine culture but also an inexhaustible source of learning, of ideological, intellectual and cultural enrichment and moral improvement. And we use this source in order to successfully accomplish the pressing tasks of our life and struggle.

To study, defend, develop and skilfully use scientific socialism in practice under most varied conditions—that is how our Party's attitude to it may be described.

Scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, was, is and will be an inspiring source of light and reason, a reliable and wise guide to action for the CPSU, for all genuine fighters for the interests of the working class and for the peoples' freedom and happiness.

Great historic victories have been won on the basis of the teaching of Marx and Lenin.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism—to new victories for the sake of peace, democracy, socialism and communism!

¹ Nadezhda Krupskaya, *On Lenin. Collection of Articles and Speeches*, Moscow, 1979, p. 317 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, p. 307.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "On Proletarian Culture", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 1974, p. 317.

MIKHAIL ZIMYANIN

Secretary, CPSU Central Committee

KARL MARX'S TEACHING LIVES ON AND TRIUMPHS

*Speech delivered at the international
scientific conference*

"Karl Marx and Our Time:

*The Battle for Peace and Social
Progress" (Berlin, April 11, 1983)*

Allow me to begin by expressing our sincere gratitude to the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany for the invitation to take part in this conference devoted to Karl Marx, that brilliant thinker, one of the founders of scientific socialism, a great champion of the internationalist cause of the working class, a glorious son of the German people.

We listened with great interest to Erich Honecker's profound and memorable speech. He convincingly showed the insuperable force of the Marxist ideas, their transformative, revolutionary spirit, and their relevance to our time, so expressively demonstrated by the achievements of the working people of the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries, and by the entire course of world history.

It is hard to name a sphere of human culture which Marx's thinking did not touch upon. The imprint of his genius can be seen in every branch of knowledge with which he came into contact. And although Marx spent the greater part of his life writing scholarly works he was far from being an ivory-tower visionary. He was a scholar of a new type: a thinker and revolutionary who drew his inspiration from the struggle waged by

the working class, to whose emancipation he devoted his whole life.

Karl Marx stood at the well-head of the Communist League, the proletariat's first class-oriented organisation. Together with Frederick Engels he founded the First International, which became an embodiment of the fraternal solidarity of workers of all countries. We Soviet Communists are especially proud that in the General Council of the International Working Men's Association Karl Marx represented our country too, Russia, the future homeland of Leninism and of the Great October Revolution.

Recalling Karl Marx, people who had known him closely said that even had he lived a century he would not have had enough time to endow the world with all the treasures that were stored in his mind. Today we can say this: the century since Marx's death has most convincingly confirmed the richness, correctness and justice of the ideas he bequeathed to mankind.

1. How Marx Revolutionised the World-Outlook

There have been thousands of theories and teachings in the history of social thought. The overwhelming majority of them have faded into limbo; the names of their authors have been forgotten too. Marxism, however, has triumphantly passed the most difficult test of all, the test of life, and has gained a firm place in the consciousness of mankind as its highest intellectual achievement.

For thousands of years the working people were in bondage to the ideology of the exploiter classes. The historic meaning of the revolution which Marx brought about in social thought was that he created a fundamentally new world-outlook, dialectical materialism, which showed the proletariat and all oppressed classes the way out of their spiritual and socio-economic slavery.

Marxism is a harmonious and consistent system of views, an integral teaching which reveals the general laws governing the development of nature, society and thinking, the laws of the revolutionary transformation of the world. Frederick Engels,

Marx's great associate and friend, took a most active part in developing this teaching. As Vladimir Lenin wrote, the proletariat "may say that its science was created by two scholars and fighters, whose relationship to each other surpasses the most moving stories of the ancients about human friendship".¹

The rise of Marxism had been prepared, objectively, by the whole of the world's previous history. The main thing here was that with the growth of capitalism a new, ascending class, the proletariat, had stepped out onto the proscenium of history. Marx demonstrated that the proletariat is a social force whose historic mission is not only to abolish capitalist oppression and exploitation but also to build a new society.

Proceeding from the tasks of the proletarian class struggle, Marx and Engels fused the highest achievements of scientific thought and provided answers to questions which history itself had posed. They creatively reworked, from the positions of materialist dialectics, the finest attainments of philosophy, political economy, utopian socialism, the science of history and natural science, and summarised the experience that had been accumulated by the working-class movement. By their titanic efforts Marx and Engels transformed socialism from a utopia into a strictly scientific theory, and gave the working class an understanding of its world-historic mission.

The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* became the programme of revolutionaries in all countries. Every line of the *Manifesto* breathes the powerful energy and will-to-win of the ascending working class, which was boldly grasping the historical initiative. Here Marx and Engels gave a brilliant exposition of the basic ideas and principles of their theory, of the key propositions of scientific socialism and of the proletariat's revolutionary policy. Here they laid the foundations of the Marxist teaching on a party in which the proletariat could join together and unite to gain political independence and strength.

Capital towers like an Everest above the majestic ridge of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Frederick Engels", *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, 1972, p. 26.

classical writings of Marxism. In this work, as Lenin said, the theory of Marxism received its most profound, comprehensive and detailed confirmation and application. Here Marx's teaching on economics is presented in full. His two most remarkable discoveries—the materialist understanding of history and the theory of surplus value—which became the foundation of scientific socialism, are set forth with unsurpassed depth and brilliance. The power of Marx's dialectical method, which shows that capitalism is doomed by history, is thoroughly revealed in the living fabric of the scientific investigation.

Karl Marx did not live to see the birth of the socialist world. The Great October Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind. Today a third of the world's population has thrown off the capitalist yoke and is building its life according to the new, socialist laws which Marx had foreseen through the veil of the decades ahead. And although capitalism is still managing to postpone its downfall, it is increasingly evident that this system is incapable of ridding itself of its inherent antagonisms. On the contrary, it is reproducing them in more and more acute forms. And no matter what our class opponents say, history is developing according to Marx.

Marx and Engels made creative development of the revolutionary theory, its inseparable links with life and its readiness to accept new, progressive ideas an organic feature of the communist movement. Their cause was continued by a glorious cohort of Marxists whose memory is cherished by the international working-class movement: August Bebel and Franz Mehring, Paul Lafargue and Georgi Plekhanov, Antonio Labriola and Dimitri Blagoev, and many others.

A new stage in the development of the theory and practice of Marxism and great victories in the battle for the communist ideals are linked up with the name of Lenin.

2. Leninism: Creative Development of Marxism

Ever since the beginning of the 20th century Marxism has been inconceivable apart from Leninism, apart from everything

the great Lenin contributed to the treasure-store of the scientific world-outlook of the working class, to the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle and to the building of a socialist society.

Leninism arose in Russia. It is inseparably connected with Russia's revolutionary destinies, with the needs and tasks of the struggle waged by its proletariat, with the heroic accomplishments of its Bolshevik Party. But it is also beyond all question that from the very beginning Leninism took shape and established itself as a teaching that is internationalist in substance, that is developing on the basis of generalisation of the experience of the entire world-wide revolutionary and liberation movement.

Lenin upheld Marxism in a struggle against revisionists and opportunists of all shades. On its basis he worked out answers to the new questions that confronted the working-class movement, the working masses and all mankind in the new historical conditions.

That was Vladimir Lenin's undying contribution. It is such a great contribution that we are fully justified in regarding Leninism as the Marxism of our era, and in giving our revolutionary teaching the name of Marxism-Leninism.

Leninism raised the Marxist teaching to a new and higher stage thanks to the fact that Lenin, a man who held the same views as Marx and Engels and was their convinced follower, clearly realised the creative substance of Marxism, incompatible with stagnation of thought. He never tired of emphasising that Marxism is not a dogma but a living creative teaching which draws its strength from the revolutionary experience of the masses. Not only did Lenin emphasise this but he himself set outstanding examples of such an approach. Applying Marx's dialectical method with consummate mastery, he made the great theoretical discoveries with which we link up the content of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism, whose component parts he enriched and amplified.

Lenin was endowed with the gift of seeing more clearly than anyone else the boundary beyond which discourses about conditions having changed could turn into lack of ideological principle and into opportunistic vagueness. History shows us that creative

development of Marxism-Leninism is possible only on the basis of its fundamental principles. Some specific assessments and propositions that were made on the basis of an analysis of concrete historical events may become outdated, but arbitrary and thoughtless rejection of fundamental Marxist-Leninist propositions leads, as a rule, to theoretical vacillation and deviations, and these result in grave political losses. The principles of our teaching have been verified by international practice. They are a powerful and effective instrument of knowledge and of revolutionary creative activity by the millions.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that Leninism embodies the basic theoretical conclusions about the nature and regularities of the contemporary era. Lenin showed that the stage of imperialism, of state monopoly capitalism, is the eve of the socialist revolution. The conclusion that the proletarian revolution can triumph at first in several countries, or even in a single country, was a major contribution to the creative development of Marxism.

Today, as before, Marx's teaching on the world-historic role of the proletariat, a teaching which Lenin developed in the light of the contemporary era, is the point of departure for resolving all the problems connected with the exercise of working-class hegemony during the struggle for democracy and socialism; connected with shaping the strategy of class alliances, above all, the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry; and connected with ensuring the leading role of the working class in building socialism. One of the main conclusions of the Leninist teaching is that the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies is a powerful stream of the world revolutionary process.

Lenin clearly realised that the theoretical conclusions of social science and even the most attractive slogans were not worth much unless they were merged with the revolutionary struggle of the working class, unless they were backed up by ideological and organisational work among the masses. He profoundly understood and comprehensively revealed the growing role of the subjective factor in the battle for socialism in the new historical conditions.

Developing Marx's ideas, he elaborated his teaching on a political party of a new type combining the massive working-class movement with scientific socialism. And he built up such a party.

Lenin created the science of how to build socialism, and he also headed its practical implementation. This science was truly the summit of his teaching.

The leader of the October Revolution framed the basic standards of the functioning of the party and the state, the Leninist standards, we call them. Unswerving observance of the Leninist standards, of the Leninist style of work, which organically combines scientific prevision and realism, a high level of organisation and initiative, efficiency and a critical attitude to shortcomings, guarantees stronger Party ties with the masses and society's moral and political unity.

No other social, political or philosophical doctrine in the world can rival Marxism-Leninism in depth and precision of analysis, or in the force and scope of its influence on the broadest masses of people. Our ideological opponents also see this. Is it to be wondered at that all who want to hinder the socialist transformation of the world attempt to deprive the revolutionary forces of their spiritual weapon?

They try to do this in many different ways: by direct attempts to discredit Marxism-Leninism; by more subtle and insidious methods, such as setting up "Western" or "European" Marxism in opposition to "Russian" or "Eastern" Leninism; by spreading the idea of a "pluralistic" Marxism. Finally, as Marxism registers more and more successes, its enemies disguise themselves as Marxists.

But all these efforts are in vain. In the ideological battle over Marxism-Leninism the historical truth is on the side of our teaching. This is neither an easy nor simple struggle, however. We cannot help seeing that the ideas of the bourgeois ideologists, reformists and revisionists of various kinds exert some influence on certain strata, including strata in the working-class and national liberation movements.

We possess a tried and tested Marxist-Leninist criterion to distinguish that which is genuinely revolutionary from the pseu-

do-revolutionary, and scientific socialism from pseudo-socialism. This is the attitude of individuals, groups or trends not only to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism but also to its living embodiment, to real socialism.

3. Real Socialism: Embodiment of the Ideas of Marxism-Leninism

Today, when socialism has become the concrete content of the life of hundreds of millions of people in many countries, there is a natural desire to compare Marx's theoretical picture of socialism with the real, existing socialist society. We can understand the comrades who want to know which of the previsions made by the founders of the revolutionary teaching have already come true, as well as which ones have not yet been fully put into practice, and why.

Let us recall how Marx himself approached questions of this kind. To begin with, he never set himself the aim of "dogmatically anticipating the future", of depicting it in all its details. He concentrated on an analysis of the objective social relations which alone could give rise to communism.¹ He therefore limited himself to general opinions on questions of principle relating to basic features of the future society.

When we sum up, today, the road we have traversed, we have every right to say, as Lenin did, that we built socialism the way Marxism taught us to, relying on Marx's conclusions concerning the substance of the new society and fundamental principles of its organisation.

When our Party began to build socialism in our country there was no other previous experience for it to follow. It goes without saying that this was an extremely difficult job, especially since the old world did not confine itself to furious internal resistance.

¹ See "A Circular of the First Congress of the Communist League to the League Members, June 9, 1847", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 598.

Imperialism did its utmost to strangle socialism by a diplomatic blockade, an economic blockade and also by armed intervention. Later there came the nazi aggression, a crucial ordeal for our country. The Soviet people withstood it all. They upheld the socialist system, their independence and their freedom, and they rescued other nations from enslavement and annihilation. Socialism triumphed completely and irreversibly in the Soviet Union. Of course, the road we travelled was not free from mistakes and shortcomings. And the Communist Party of the Soviet Union spoke about them openly.

Our ideological adversaries focus attention on details of socialist life that do not correspond to the socialist ideal. They allege that real socialism is "deficient" and has to be "humanised"; they claim that Marx's theories are "obsolete".

What can be said to that? History itself has confirmed all—I emphasise, all—the fundamental conclusions of the theory of scientific communism. The abolition of private ownership of the basic means of production, the abolition of exploitation, unemployment and economic crises, the steady expansion of production, the subordination of production to the people's interests, the birth of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, as practice shows, gradually develops into a state of the whole people, and the establishment of genuine democracy are all inalienable features of real socialism. All this strikingly illustrates the great vital force and historical truth of the Marxist-Leninist ideas.

As we have seen from the example of our country, the rise and development of socialism passes through a series of historically essential stages. First of all, there is the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism. In this period the possibility of restoration of capitalism by hostile forces is still a fairly acute question. Experience shows that mistakes in policy by ruling parties can lead to a revival of counter-revolutionary, restorationist efforts by hostile groups of one kind or another. Active support of these groups from abroad by imperialist reactionaries can, if the necessary counter measures are not taken, create a real threat to the revolutionary gains. Government by the working class in an alliance with all other working people, a type of government whose

class essence Marx, Engels and Lenin defined as the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a political guarantee of society's development in the direction of socialism, a guarantee of defence of the new system.

The period of transition ends when the foundations of socialism have been built. There then follows a relatively long period of history in which the new socio-economic forms are consolidated, the productive forces undergo dynamic growth, and labour and production are further socialised. The socialist state of the whole people, mature socialist relations and clearer socialist awareness among the people gradually take shape in the process of interaction of the friendly classes and social groups.

Solution of all the problems that arise in the building of the new society, both in the transitional period and in the period of establishing developed, mature socialism, depends to an immense degree on the ability of the ruling Communist Party to listen attentively to the voice of the people, persistently combat manifestations of dogmatism and arbitrary decision-making, deepen socialist democracy, carry out a realistic, well-thought-out policy, strengthen unity and cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, and give a firm and timely rebuff to any imperialist attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of these countries.

The highest level of social progress achieved today is the stage of developed socialism. Here socialism becomes, as Marx put it, an integral whole.

It can confidently be said that at the present stage of the development of socialism in our country the need for a Marxist analysis of social phenomena acquires special importance. Let us take Marx's forecast of the development of socialism's social structure. Assessing the experience of our social progress in recent decades, the 26th Congress of the CPSU put forward the proposition that the formation of a classless structure of society will take place chiefly and mainly within the historical framework of mature socialism.

The fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism on the nature of the relations among the nationalities under socialism are also being confirmed. The Soviet Union has successfully solved one

of the most complicated social questions, the nationalities problem, in the form in which it came down to us from the past, of course. Internationalist unity, fraternal friendship and cooperation among the peoples, has been established in our country.

We see today that the real process is going ahead just the way Marx foresaw it would.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union clearly sees the existing difficulties, the unresolved problems and the new tasks that confront the Soviet people in the closing decades of the 20th century. As Yuri Andropov has emphasised, "Taken together, these tasks are reducible to what could be described as the perfecting of developed socialism... Our country is at the beginning of this long historical stage, which, in turn, will naturally have its own periods and its stages of growth."¹

On the basis of an all-round assessment of the potential of mature socialism and the specific features of the present international situation the CPSU drew up, and is implementing, a strategy for Soviet society's further advance. In the period ahead we are to complete the switchover of the economy to intensive development and restructure the entire economic mechanism accordingly so that the Soviet economy becomes an integration of science and production, an inviolable union of creative thought and creative work. In resolving these questions we take our bearings from Marx's analysis of extended reproduction of the intensive type, which is characterised, as he said, not by an enlarged field of production but by application of more effective methods.² It was from these positions that the Party drafted the Food Programme and Energy Programme of the USSR.

Reflecting on the communist society of the future, Marx believed that people there would organise the process of production so rationally that it would go ahead "with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favourable to, and worthy

¹ See this book, p. 30.

² See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 175.

of, their human nature".¹ This combination of the rational and human is receiving ever fuller expression today.

On the basis of economic growth the social programmes are constantly being expanded and better conditions provided for all-round development of the individual, for the education of a new type of man, which Marx, Engels and Lenin called the supreme goal of communism.

Understandably, there are still some things that are not yet going along smoothly and simply; at times we do not manage to carry out our plans in full and on schedule. We attach importance to improving organisation and discipline steadily, raising labour productivity and heightening the effectiveness of social production.

The Party and the people are concentrating their efforts on solving topical problems of our country's social and economic development according to the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and the November 1982 Plenary Meeting of the Party's Central Committee. This Plenary Meeting made a searching analysis of the progress in carrying out the Eleventh Five-Year Plan and laid bare, in the Party spirit, the difficulties and shortcomings in our work. Its decisions and Yuri Andropov's speeches at the Plenary Meeting and at the USSR 60th anniversary celebrations put forward key tasks of communist construction and of further consolidating our Motherland's economic and defence potentials. The Soviet people are working selflessly to put the Party's plans into practice.

We cannot imagine successfully solving the problems that confront us without constantly developing socialist democracy. Our goal is to ensure greater participation by the working masses in the management of state and public affairs, and wider creative initiative and resourcefulness of the masses in all spheres of life.

All this does not mean, of course, that the mechanism of socialist democracy in our country is perfect. There are still quite a few instances of red tape and insufficient attention to people's

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, 1978, p. 53.

Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States put forward new, highly important and constructive initiatives designed to attain those goals. These initiatives were welcomed by all who oppose the nuclear threat and who stand for the development of broad international co-operation on a basis of equality.

Our Party, true to the behests of Marx, Engels and Lenin, regards it as its duty to do everything it can to promote the battle waged by various detachments of the world-wide revolutionary movement, by all who oppose imperialism and advocate peace and social progress. We are convinced that today, as always before, the principle of proletarian internationalism is a reliable principle in rallying all these forces.

Soviet Communists have never regarded this concept as something frozen, as unchanging. We see that in the present-day conditions the growing importance of the tasks connected with the anti-imperialist struggle lends more significance to the overall-democratic aspect of proletarian internationalism. But this, we are convinced, does not detract from its class, anti-capitalist substance.

The growth and broadening of the ranks of the revolutionary forces, coupled with the special, I would say, burning topicality of the task of social and national emancipation, increase the objective need for solidarity of the revolutionaries, for their united efforts. Today, proletarian, socialist internationalism in its Marxist-Leninist understanding means, above all, active efforts to assure unity of the socialist community, the rallying of all the socialist countries, and defence of the historic gains of socialism. Naturally, with the specific features of each country taken into full account, and with mutual respect for one another's sovereignty and interests.

Today, proletarian internationalism means active support of all the forces in the world that oppose capitalist domination and every other form of oppression.

Today, proletarian internationalism in its Marxist-Leninist understanding also means maximum promotion of unity among the

fraternal communist, workers' and revolutionary-democratic parties in the struggle for the common goals.

Proletarian internationalism presupposes an uncompromising struggle against all attempts to disunite the revolutionary forces, to disunite the communist parties, no matter what labels, nationalistic or opportunistic, are used to disguise these attempts.

Proletarian internationalism in the Marxist-Leninist understanding means, finally, readiness to do everything to solve the problems that affect the future of all mankind, first and foremost, the main problem, that of preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

Proletarian internationalism accords with the interests of social progress, the interests of all nations, of all mankind. It is a sacred duty of all genuine Communists, of all who by their actions, and not just in words, are true to the great behests of our teachers.

* * *

Together with our comrades and like-minded people in other countries, we Soviet Communists look boldly to the future. Our era has brought Marxism unprecedented victories. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism, capturing the minds of many millions of people, are being put into practice. They have become a powerful revolutionising, transformative force. And so today we have every right to repeat the words Frederick Engels spoke about his great friend and associate a hundred years ago: "His name will endure through the ages, and so will his work!"¹

¹ F. Engels, "Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 163.

PYOTR FEDOSEYEV

**Vice-President,
USSR Academy of Sciences**

KARL MARX AND THE DIALECTICS OF OUR TIME¹

Progressive mankind has named the year 1983 the year of Karl Marx. May 5, 1983, was the 165th anniversary of his birth, and one hundred years ago, on March 14, 1883, his mighty heart ceased to beat. Strenuous work to organise the international proletarian revolutionary movement, hounding by the authorities, constant material need, and exhaustingly intense theoretical studies undermined and ultimately ruined his health. History allotted Marx but 65 years of life, yet what he accomplished will live for ages.

Marx's main service to mankind was that, in close cooperation and creative association with his loyal friend and staunch comrade-in-arms Frederick Engels, he established the ideological foundation for the world's revolutionary renewal. He scientifically proved the necessity and the feasibility of fundamentally restructuring the millennia-old and outdated social conditions of human civilisation and of the entire life of society, and of remaking them on the basis of truly human and truly just communist principles.

For centuries on end the working people had suffered from three main social vices: exploitation of man by man, national and racial oppression, and devastating wars. From generation to generation, progressive-minded thinkers passed on the dream of universal equality and fraternity of all men and peoples, and of eternal peace and concord. Yet there were neither the material prerequisites nor a suitable revolutionary force therefore; nor was there a knowledge of how to achieve that age-old dream.

¹ This article was written on the basis of a paper presented at the General Meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences on March 2, 1983, and published in part in the journals *World Marxist Review* (No. 3, 1983) and *Voprosy Filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy, No. 4, 1983).

In this respect, the 19th century was a turning point in world history because it created the material and social prerequisites for the revolutionary remaking of society. This time of great change was formulated in Marxist theory, which marked a revolution in the history of social thought. Marx's teaching opened up the possibility and means of liberating the working classes from exploitation, of doing away with national oppression, and of delivering mankind from sanguinary wars.

Of course, the emergence of Marxism, like that of any theory of social significance, was conditioned by objective factors. The social foundation on which Marxism could have developed consisted of the further growth and socialisation of production under capitalism; the discovery of the profound antagonistic contradictions inherent in capitalism, primarily contradictions between labour and capital; and the initial revolutionary actions of the proletariat.

Marx's teaching is inseparably connected with the prior development of progressive social thought. As Lenin showed, Marxism did not arise away from the high road of world civilisation, but "as the direct and immediate *continuation* of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism".¹

In the first half of the 19th century it became patently obvious that capitalism brought the nations a new form of slavery, not freedom. Even before Marx, socialist thinkers Fourier, Saint-Simon, and Owen had revealed the crying vices of capitalism and irreconcilable antagonism between labour and capital, between wage workers and capitalists. It was not only socialists but thinking people in general who were shocked by the brutality of capitalist exploitation. The bourgeois way of life was outrageous and repugnant to all progressive people, and this led to intensive and tormenting quests for ways of attaining a better social structure. Yet in the absence of a knowledge of the laws of social development nothing could result except fantastic pro-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1973, p. 23.

jects or groundless dreams of a return to the past, to the mythical "Golden Age". Nobody had either a clear and well-founded idea as to whether history was bound, or of ways of eliminating the tormenting and unbearable social vices oppressing working mankind.

At this turning point of history Marx's genius provided answers to the challenge of the century, to the burning issues of social development, which were, in Lenin's words, "already raised by the foremost minds of mankind".¹

What is the secret of Marxism's immortality? Where does it draw its viability and effectiveness from?

Chiefly from the fact that its founder relied solidly on science and linked theory inseparably to revolutionary practice, generalising the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat. Marx was a great scholar and a great revolutionary, and these two aspects of his genius are organically interrelated. One can say that he was a revolutionary in science and a scholar in revolutionary struggle.

It was in revolutionary activity that Marx perceived the material force for restructuring society on just principles, namely, on the basis of communist equality and in the name of all-round development of the individual. And to his dying day he was loyal to the great cause of the struggle to implement the communist ideals.

Marx understood scientific research as tireless creative work requiring perseverance, endurance and a dedicated quest for new roads of human progress. He said: "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits."² To serve the interest of the working class and to bring about the revolutionary renewal of society Marx was the first to traverse a hard and thorny road to the summits of science.

Marx saw science as an active motive force capable of revolutionising production and politics. As Lenin put it, influenced

¹ *Ibid.*

² K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 30.

by Marx's scientific studies and his method, "politics had turned from chaos and fraud into a science".¹

In short, Marx and Engels approached humankind's basic problems not only as great humanists but also as great realistic scholars and revolutionaries.

In terms of class content, Marxism is the theory and tactics of the proletariat in its struggle to remake society along socialist lines. As a science, the theory of Marx and Engels is an integral and harmonious system of philosophical, economic, and socio-political views comprehensively substantiating the law-governed ways and means of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

It became possible to substantiate this transition philosophically because Marx and Engels had enriched materialism with dialectics, in other words, with a comprehensive theory of development, and had worked out a materialistic understanding of history. Briefly, the essence of this comes to the following.

The need for social renewal is rooted in the universal law of development. If the world is undergoing perpetual change and development, the forms of social life cannot remain rigid and immutable either. Hence, the supremacy of exploiter classes, suppression and robbery of the working masses, and enrichment of an insignificant minority at the expense of the vast majority of the world's population cannot continue for ever. Just as material structures, animal and plant species change in nature, so history involves the development and replacement of socio-economic systems.

In reference to society, the materialistic understanding of the universal law of development signifies that, just as all natural phenomena have material causes, the development of socio-economic systems is determined by material factors, primarily by the development of productive forces. The forms of social relations depend on the development of the productive forces, and the former, in turn, determine the nature of a given political

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism" (plan), *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 443 (Fifth Russian Edition).

structure, of human concepts and ideas. In bourgeois society, growth of the productive forces leads to concentration of property in the hands of a small group of capitalists and monopoly amalgamations, and to concentration and socialisation of production. The social nature of production does not put up with private ownership of the means of production; as a result, human mind naturally develops ideas on the need for the means of production to pass into the hands of the whole of society.

However, scientific socialism relies not only on the materialistic concept that replacement of one socio-economic formation by another is a natural development. In effect, there was a need to determine whether the time was ripe and the essential conditions available to restructure the existing social system. The answer to this fundamental issue of theory and practice was provided by the Marxist analysis of the economic structure of capitalism. Figuratively, Marx called *Capital*, his principal work, the most devastating shell fired at the heads of the bourgeoisie. He revealed the "secret" of capitalist exploitation, showing in what way the capitalists appropriate surplus value, i.e., the part of value created over and above the paid portion of wage labour. He thereby laid bare the economic roots of the implacable antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie, making it clear that the class struggle between them would inevitably grow increasingly acute until the exploitation of man by man was completely eradicated. Having elucidated the sources and the process of accumulation of capital, Marx showed the economic factors upon which the concentration and socialisation of production, the ruin of small producers, and the continuous growth in the number and share of the working class are essentially based. Thus, as a result of his huge, truly titanic, research Marx was able to scientifically prove the historical doom of the capitalist socio-economic system, and also the objective need for transition to a new, communist society, to reveal the epoch-making role of the proletariat as a class which, according to Lenin, is in effect "the intellectual and moral motive force and the physical executor"¹ of the transformation of capitalist society into communist society.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, 1977, p. 71.

Marx not only foresaw the general trend of historical development but determined, on the basis of an objective socio-economic analysis, the possible stages of development of the future society. His teaching on the two phases of communism: socialism as the first phase, and communist society as its higher phase, was a brilliant prevision. Marx's historical realism is to be seen in his understanding of the fact that socialism, too, would not be established at once, that a more or less lengthy transitional period from capitalism to socialism would be required.

Guided by a desire not only to explain the world but to help remake it, Marx worked unremittingly on ways of attaining this goal and organising a revolutionary working-class movement. Together with Frederick Engels he developed the fundamentals of the theory and policies of the Communists and the international principles and organisational forms of the liberation struggle of the working class and all capital-oppressed masses.

A fundamental question in the substantiation of revolutionary strategy is the role of the individual in, and the scope of his influence on, the course of historical events. Basing itself on materialist dialectics, Marxism, for the first time in the history of social thought, resolved the age-old argument about the relation between necessity and freedom of will, between law-governed development patterns and the human factor, and between causality and the role of people's interests and aims in their behaviour and in the entire historical process.

This age-old dispute had arisen as a result of a one-sided interpretation of the processes that take place in society. The thinkers who maintained that human behaviour was conditioned by laws of nature or by a supernatural being underestimated the significance of human activity; they leaned towards a passive, contemplative trend of thought. On the other hand, those who regarded historical events as the result solely of human will and arbitrary action failed to see the laws of history and thought it possible to change the course of events at will.

Marxism took as its point of departure the obvious fact that, unlike the laws of nature, which operate without human involvement, the laws of social life manifest themselves in the activity of

human beings who possess consciousness and will and are motivated by specific interests and aims. It is man himself who makes history. Not arbitrarily, however, but by virtue of necessity. Men act in conditions created by nature and history, and either obey those conditions or remake them in conformity with the laws of development of material life. These tenets overcame the one-sided naturalistic and idealistic approaches that lead now to contemplation and fatalism, now to subjectivism and voluntarism.

A materialistic generalisation of the basic issues of the entire historical process and an economic analysis of the capitalist social system underlie the socio-political views of Marxism. Proceeding from the fact that the whole history of society since the rise of private property and the division into classes was a history of class struggle, and taking into account that increasing contradictions between the further socialisation of production and the private capitalist ownership of the means of production were inevitable, as correspondingly was growing antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie, Marxism inferred that a socialist revolution would naturally occur to put an end to the rule of capital and to establish the rule of the working class that could organise social production without exploiters and based on social ownership of the means of production. Marx termed this rule of the working class "the dictatorship of the proletariat", as opposed to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Marx's theory was successfully tested during his lifetime. The revolutions of 1848 in Europe and the Paris Commune in 1871 were vivid expressions of the acute and irreconcilable contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and provided new concrete historical experience for developing his theory of class struggle. And though the first heroic attempt of the Paris Communards to establish a socialist state governed by the working people failed, it nonetheless showed that the historical law of the future self-liberation of the working people, as established by the founders of Marxism, was beginning to carve its way.

To achieve its epoch-making aims the working class needed a vanguard, a revolutionary party. Marx and Engels and their associates began to turn the revolutionary ideas into a material

force, into motive force of revolutionary changes on which the historical destiny of the working-class movement and of Marxism itself depended. Their crowning achievement in this direction was the founding of the International Working Men's Association, the First International, and the organisation of the first mass political parties of the working class in Europe.

At the turn of the 20th century, when the peaceful period of capitalism's development had come to an end and the working class had entered the stage of revolutionary battles for the socialist reorganisation of society, Lenin developed the theory and cause of Marx and Engels. He initiated and founded a new type of party consistent with the new aims of the class struggle. His unfading service to the international working class is that, in a struggle against opportunists of every stripe who were demoralising the political parties of the Second International, he upheld Marxism as the scientific ideology and policy of the revolutionary party, the party's class nature. Lenin proceeded from the premise that the party, being the forefront detachment of the working class and possessing a revolutionary theory, is the force that lends working-class struggle a high level of organisation and of political awareness. The revolutionary party and its activity combine socialist ideas and the working-class movement.

Eighty years ago, at the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, Russia's revolutionary Marxist organisations merged to form the Bolshevik Party, a new-type Marxist-Leninist party of the working class. Its theory and tactics were tested in practice during the revolutionary battles of 1905-07. As Lenin put it, the Russian Revolution of 1905 was a dress rehearsal for 1917.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, carried out under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, was a historic triumph of Marxism-Leninism. It marked the beginning of social and national liberation and ushered in a new era in history, the era of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism on a world-wide scale. The first victorious socialist revolution in Rus-

sia was followed by revolutionary transformations in quite a number of countries.

Leninism organically continued and developed Marxism on the basis of the new historical experience. Without this creative enrichment by Lenin's ideas, the tremendous influence of Marxism on modern times would have been unthinkable. Proceeding from and further developing Marx's theory, Lenin advanced to a height from which he could observe the general course of world history in the 20th century, disclose the essence of the new historical epoch, reveal the main streams and class forces in the revolutionary movement, establish the alignment of these forces on the main fronts of the struggle for socialism, and determine the prospects for socialist construction. In the new historical conditions he not only had to theoretically interpret the fundamental social problems of mankind but to tackle them in practice.

Lenin demonstrated that the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism and of the class struggle, processes revealed by Marx, had become much more intensive in the 20th century. At the same time, the huge growth of productive forces was accompanied by growing material prerequisites for the transition from capitalism to socialism. It became possible to end the exploitation of man by man and abolish the exploiter classes themselves, first in the USSR and then in some other countries. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production, the socialisation of all sectors of production and their further development along socialist lines constituted the principal economic foundation for eliminating the exploiter social system. Eliminated together with private ownership were economic crises, unemployment and want. The countries in which this was achieved were not among the most developed ones. The material and social prerequisites for resolving this problem in the more developed capitalist countries through the revolutionary transformation of society were all the more mature. Of course, as Marx and Lenin pointed out, it is much harder to begin the socialist revolution in the citadels of capitalism, for the bourgeoisie there has much stronger positions for social manoeuvring and political manipulation. But in the more developed countries it is easier and takes less time to organise

socialist production and build the material and technical base of communism.

The experience of the socialist countries not only proves the possibility of abolishing the exploitation of man by man but indicates the ways and means of ending class divisions generally and achieving complete social homogeneity.

Lenin often noted that socialism means the abolition of classes. We now see in practice that this is a long process, the first steps of which are the abolition of the exploiter classes and capitalist elements generally and the reshaping of the small-proprietor system through organising small producers in cooperatives. This is followed by the erasure of the social distinctions between the working class, the collective-farm peasantry, and the socialist intelligentsia. Taking the underlying trends of the further development of social relations into account, the 26th Congress of the CPSU drew the conclusion that the formation of a classless society would apparently occur mainly within the historical bounds of mature socialism. Class boundaries could be erased completely with society's transition to the higher phase of communism.

A major factor in erasing class distinctions between the working class and the peasantry is the drawing together of the two forms of socialist property: state property (the property belonging to all the people) and collective farm-and-cooperative property.

It should be noted that, in discussing the ways of drawing these two forms of socialist property closer, the accent was often put on rapidly transforming cooperative, collective-farm production into state farm production. In effect, this approach underestimated the possibilities of collective farm-and-cooperative ownership, which are still far from having been exhausted; at the same time, this was tantamount to underrating the leading, restructuring role of ownership by the entire people.

Practice has shown that the principal way of solving this task is by creating and spreading inter-collective farm and mixed state-collective farm production enterprises and associations. By now, much has already been done to form and organise the latter, and to develop agroindustrial integration. The social significance

of agroindustrial associations at various levels has now been confirmed by the experience of many socialist countries, which permits us to make some conclusions.

First, a practical way has been found to draw the two forms of ownership closer together on the basis of increased socialisation of production.

Second, a mechanism of interaction between the two forms of property enabling fuller realisation of their possibilities and the creation of conditions for increasing the productivity of social labour has been determined.

Third, effective cooperation has been organised between workers of various industrial sectors united by common interest in producing commodities for the whole of society. This is a common social interest that attains the level of the interest of all the people.

The policy of forming and developing the agroindustrial complex concretises Lenin's cooperative plan with regard to the current level of productive forces and mature socialist production relations.

Of course, not only collective farm-and-cooperative ownership but state ownership, too, needs to be continually perfected and developed. It is only by perfecting the latter that the working class can ensure its own progressive development, its leading role relative to the other strata of society, and its movement towards and fusion with them in a socially homogeneous entity. This requires the fulfilment of such major tasks of communist construction as a consistent reduction of manual, low-skilled work, surmounting of the negative social effects of the division of labour and elimination of the social distinctions between labour by hand and by brain. This means organically combining these two forms of labour in the production activity of people.

That is how the Marxist-Leninist propositions on removing the age-old class antagonisms and society's division into classes and social strata are being translated into reality.

Marx and Engels convincingly proved that national inequality and colonial oppression are linked indivisibly to private property and bourgeois society's class structure, to the nature of the

capitalist world system. They said that the "existing property relations... involve the exploitation of some nations by others".¹ Capitalism intensified and exacerbated national oppression by adding colonial oppression to it. The question of national liberation, of the abolition of the colonial system, could not be raised outside the general struggle to abolish all social oppression, the struggle against the exploiter classes and exploitation of man by man. Marx and Engels wrote: "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to."²

The Great October Socialist Revolution broke the chains of class and national oppression to open, under the leadership of Lenin's Party, the way to true equality and fraternity among working people of all races and nations, to their unhampered and all-round development.

Lenin emphasised that the purpose of socialism is not only to abolish the division of humankind into small states and to put an end to all isolation of nations, and not only to draw them closer together, but to ensure their fusion. However, he saw the way to that through complete liberation of all oppressed nations, through free choice of self-determination. The right of nations to freely secede from, and to associate in, unions—such is the truly democratic principle of their development. In determining the nationalities policy and programme of the Communists, Lenin wrote in April 1917 that the Party "...strives to *draw nations closer together*, and bring about their *further fusion*; but it desires to achieve this aim not by violence, but exclusively through a free fraternal union of the workers and the working people of all nations".³

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "On Poland", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 388.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *op. cit.* p. 503.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 1974, p. 73.

Sometimes the fusion of nations is interpreted in a simplified way as a process of doing away with their specific features and distinctions. In reality, however, the merger of nations in a higher entity is essentially a lengthy and multiform historical process which begins with the drawing together of nations, not with elimination of national distinctions, to ultimately end in the obliteration of all traces of national isolation and in the establishment of the higher form of human community. Speaking of the fusion of nations, Lenin meant various stages and forms of this process, namely unification of the working people of various nations in the liberation struggle against exploiters; their unification after the victory of a socialist revolution in an integral state; complete unity of nations in socialist society; and so on. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet nations voluntarily associated in a single state and drew closer and closer together, steadily strengthening their mutual trust and inviolable friendship.

In organising social production without exploiters and in ensuring prosperity and a multiform and rich cultural life for all members of society, socialism provides full scope for the development of a variety of political forms of statehood of the nations and nationalities; in this way it facilitates and accelerates their drawing closer together and subsequent fusion.

Lenin repeatedly noted that socialism creates new forms of social ties, new conditions for consolidating society and for unifying nations and nationalities, primarily on the basis of an alliance of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, on the basis of implementing the fruitful principles of socialist internationalism. One of these new forms of social and internationalist ties is that new historical community, the Soviet people, an entity that neither absorbs nor replaces existing nations but embodies their inviolable unity.

Anybody looking back at our country's history since the Great October Socialist Revolution and the founding of the USSR will see how much has been done for the comprehensive development of all the nations and nationalities inhabiting the united multinational Soviet state. Under the leadership of the Communist

Party, with the working class playing the leading role and with the Russian people extending fraternal assistance, all the nations and nationalities of the USSR, including those of the former backward regions, have made great social progress. The hallmarks of all the Soviet republics today are a modern industry, a developed agriculture, steady economic growth and rising living standards, a developing national statehood, a high level of science, and a flourishing culture. Yet each has preserved its identity, its national features. What is taking place throughout the period of the building and development of socialist society up to the moment when complete communism is finally reached is the flowering of nations in the true sense of the word, the all-sided development of their languages and cultures on the basis of internationalist cooperation and unbreakable friendship among them.

The dialectics of history is such that the drawing together and merging of nations takes place through maximum development and many-sided manifestation of their intrinsic potentialities and creative abilities. National-state frontiers and other international boundaries will disappear only when communism is established world-wide. Then the merging of nations will mean the intensive interaction and inter-penetration by national cultures on a global scale and the internationalist consolidation of all humankind.

As historically-shaped entities, nations have been and continue to be an important form of social progress. However, the development of nations should not lead to isolation, to conceit or arrogance, but should involve an understanding of common interests and the fulfilment of common tasks in building a communist society.

Displays of national narrow-mindedness are connected with various survivals of bourgeois views and traits. We probably fail to analyse sufficiently the connection between this narrow-mindedness and the mentality of individualism and echoes of the private property ideology. Internationalism is organically linked with the ideology and practice of collectivism. Nationalism, on the other hand, is hostile to collectivism; its invariable satellite

or prop, to be more exact, is bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualism.

We know that under capitalism proletarian internationalism is fostered in joint struggle by the workers against the power of capital. In socialist society, the main school of internationalism is collective work and fraternal mutual assistance by the working people of all nations on the basis of public ownership. The ideological source of internationalism is the communist world-outlook, whose principle, the principle of collectivism, is embodied in the motto: "One for all and all for one."

There is every reason to say that internationalism is collectivism in the relations, work and life of peoples of different nations. To deviate from the ideology and practice of collectivism is to become nationalistically prejudiced.

The USSR has a rich socialist culture, multinational in form and profoundly internationalist in essence. However, writers and artists infected with individualism and self-conceit occasionally fall under the influence of chauvinist or nationalist prejudices and become their bearers and disseminators. In their works they set off one people against another, representatives of one nation against representatives of other nations, and also the old bourgeois or feudal-landlord way of life against the socialist way of life.

One can cite examples from another sphere as well. The Marxist-Leninist scientific elucidation of world history and the history of our country affords abundant material for internationalist and patriotic education. Yet in this sphere too there are lapses and misinterpretations. Some scholars with individualistic views and provincial mentalities deviate from the principles of internationalism; often they idealise the old days, tsars, dukes and khans, give a distorted, nationalistic interpretation of historical events, and harm the cause of internationalist and patriotic education.

The Communist Party, loyal to Lenin's behests, educates Soviet people in a spirit of internationalism, respect for the national feelings and national dignity of every person, and intolerance of nationalistic egoism and arrogance.

The experience obtained in solving the nationalities problem

in the USSR indicates a verified way of developing truly humane relations between nations and provides prospects for the internationalist unity of mankind.

Summing up the Soviet Union's sixty years of progress, Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasised: "History has fully borne out the theory of Marx and Lenin that the nationalities question can only be settled on a class basis. National discord and all forms of racial and national inequality and oppression receded into the past together with social antagonisms."¹

The elimination of the social sources and causes of war and the attainment of world peace are likewise linked to the struggle against domination by exploiting classes, and, in our day especially, to the abolition of the power of monopoly corporations and the military-industrial complex, to the extirpation of their pernicious influence on international relations, and to the exposure of imperialism's aggressive policies.

It is noteworthy that the first decree of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie, was Lenin's Decree on Peace, proclaiming the deliverance of humanity from the horrors of war and its aftermaths to be the most important task of the working class. Capitalism was, and is, the source of wars and the threat of war, but socialism and peace are organically interrelated. The Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems is the only possible and realistic policy in a world divided into two opposing systems.

Marx and Engels pointed out that an understanding of what gives rise to the threat of war is a crucial organising factor in actions to prevent war, against the warmongers. The workers have a huge potential for safeguarding peace, for fighting the aggressive intentions of bourgeois states. Their duty, to use Marx's words, is "to master themselves the mysteries of international politics;

¹ Y. V. Andropov, *Sixtieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1982, p. 7.

to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice ... as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".¹

Analysing the great danger hanging over humankind, the Marxists-Leninists show where this threat is coming from. The threat of a nuclear catastrophe was created by US imperialism. Today the danger is being intensified by the most aggressive militarist circles, who are blinded by their class hatred of socialism and who shape the actions of the present US Administration.

What makes the present international situation unique is the fact that imperialism has pushed civilisation to the brink of destruction. The prospects for humankind's social emancipation depend on elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. Peace is now not merely a condition favouring social progress; it has now become indispensable for it.

Prevention of a nuclear catastrophe is the chief task in world politics, the chief task of the Communists and of all peoples. A nuclear catastrophe could destroy civilisation and possibly all life on earth. It would be global in every sense. In the face of this danger the preservation of peace has become crucial to all humankind.

The attitude of the Marxists-Leninists to a nuclear war thus springs from the humane principles of the communist world-outlook, from the peaceful nature of socialism, from the basic interests of the working class and mankind as a whole. We are unquestionably opposed to such a war, we hold that it cannot be permitted, and we will do everything we can to prevent it. Expressing the stand of the Soviet Communists on this issue, General Secretary Yuri Andropov declared: "Veritably, one has to be blind to the realities of our time not to see that wherever and however a nuclear whirlwind arises, it will inevitably go out of

¹ K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 18.

control and cause a world-wide catastrophe. Our position on this issue is clear: a nuclear war—whether big or small, whether limited or total—must not be allowed to break out. No task is more important today than to stop the instigators of another war. This is required by the vital interests of all nations.”¹

In our important time, when the destiny of mankind is being decided, Soviet people draw from Marx’s ideas their social optimism, their confidence that a nuclear catastrophe will be prevented and that the cause of peace and communism will triumph. The optimism of the Communists is founded on their knowledge of the laws of history, on their ability fearlessly to recognise and assess the danger, on their determination to fight it, on their taking account of the factors making it possible to remove the danger, and on their understanding that the forces of peace and revolution are growing in the course of the struggle.

Today, Marx’s conviction that the elimination of the rule of capital, the principal source of aggressive wars, and the emergence and establishment of a new, socialist society engaged in peaceful constructive endeavour, would open the way to stable peace on earth, is being confirmed in practice. In expressing this conviction, Marx wrote: “. . . in contrast to the old society, with its economical miseries and its political delirium, a new society is springing up, whose International rule will be *Peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*Labour!*”²

In reviewing world developments and assessing the experience that has been gained since Marx and Engels laid the foundations of the communist world view, we clearly see:

—that the main trend of world development follows the course they predicted, namely, revolutionary transition from the capitalist to the communist socio-economic system;

—that this historical process of humankind’s liberation from exploitation, social and national oppression, and wars, is being

¹ Y. V. Andropov, *Sixtieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 22.

² K. Marx, “The Civil War in France”, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 193.

accomplished as a result of massive people's movements led by the working class, whose historic mission was spelled out and substantiated by Marx and Engels;

—that the party of the working class, guided by the revolutionary theory evolved by Marx and Engels, is the recognised force organising the masses in their struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

The CPSU sees Marxism-Leninism as indispensable for solving the problems posed by modern social development, for socialism's further successful progress towards communism, and in indicating the way to the triumph of peace throughout the world. In effect, Marxism-Leninism has served as the basis for such major contributions to revolutionary theory and practice as the concept of developed socialism elaborated by the CPSU and other fraternal communist parties, and the pinpointing of the specific features of the world revolutionary process under conditions when existing socialism has become the determining factor in international politics.

The building of socialism in the USSR and other countries was a real embodiment and live corroboration of Marx's teaching. Whereas the socialist revolution confirmed the validity of Marx's theory that capitalism is doomed as a social system, only the successful building of a socialist society could confirm the cardinal conclusion of Marx's theory, namely, the possibility of achieving the communist ideals. The historic significance of the building of socialism in the USSR and some other countries is that it has shown the international working class and all other fighters for progress that our communist ideal is not a utopia, that it is attainable. This has reinforced the morale of the communist and working-class movement. At the same time, qualitatively new conditions have taken shape for the further creative development of the theory of scientific socialism. Socialist theory used to be based on analysis of the contradictions and development trends of bourgeois society. Today, it rests not only on such analysis but also on its own basis, on existing and developing socialism. Moreover, Marxist-Leninist science now faces much bigger tasks, for now it is a matter of solving the entirely new

and extremely complex theoretical and practical problems of building a communist society.

The building of socialism in the USSR and other countries marked a qualitatively new stage in the historical destinies of Marx's theory and in the social progress of mankind. Yuri Andropov's article, "Karl Marx's Teaching and Some of the Problems in the Building of Socialism in the USSR", published in *Kommunist* gives a striking and thorough account of the great significance of this teaching for our time, for building a new society. The article gives a profound and concrete analysis of the results and problems of socialist construction, and maps the ways for resolving those problems. It focuses our attention on the need to elaborate fundamental theoretical problems, to overcome all kinds of opportunistic demands or scholastic theoretisation.

Naturally, the main prerequisite for this work should be basic research in the principal aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory, namely, in philosophy, political economy and scientific communism. The main task is to further elaborate materialist dialectics, a reliable and effective method of the social sciences in the cognition of objective processes, and the philosophical theory of the world's revolutionary renewal. This involves, above all, a study of new forms of the struggle of opposites in world development, and of new sources of development and new types of contradictions in establishing the communist social formation, and also an analysis of their nature and peculiarities. To develop and apply dialectics is an essential prerequisite for further elaborating political economy, scientific communism and the entire complex of the social sciences, a basis for a scientific prevision of the future and for theoretical substantiation of the issues of communist construction.

Works of the theory of dialectics which attempt to philosophically interpret processes of current social development and to sum up the achievements of the natural and social sciences have appeared recently. However, we cannot rest content with these attempts. We must elaborate more fully new questions of the theory and practice. The core of philosophic research involves

the dialectics of our time, especially the dialectics of the establishment and development of socialism.

The great significance of the Marxist-Leninist theory of two phases of communism, with socialism as its first phase, is precisely that it regards the communist social system dialectically, i.e., in development, in historical perspective.

One of the most topical general theoretical problems relating to the establishment and consolidation of existing socialism is a deep-going elaboration of the concept of the developed socialist society, a concept which, based on the practice of socialist construction, was formulated as a result of joint efforts by the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist community. This concept creates a stable theoretical and methodological foundation for further studying ways of advancing to communism, for presenting a full and integral exposition of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the laws of development of the communist formation, on the transition from its first, lower, phase to its second, higher, phase.

The joint conclusion made by the communist and workers' parties of socialist countries concerning developed socialism as the natural outgrowth of the first phase of communism, is a major contribution to the theory of scientific communism. From this conclusion it first of all follows that the transition to the higher phase of communism cannot instantly begin once socialism had been attained, and that socialism is not a short-term phase, but a lengthy period of development on its own foundation and with its own specific problems and methods for solving them.

For a long time the approach to the question of the foundation on which socialism develops was based on what Marx said about the initial phase of socialism: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has *developed* on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it *emerges* from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges."¹ This is valid for every

¹ K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, 1976, p. 17.

country during the initial period of socialist construction. However, for those countries that have completed socialist restructuring, it would be incorrect to maintain that subsequently they develop on the foundation they inherited from capitalist society and, from that premise, to try to understand the nature of social relations and the laws reflecting them. Those countries develop on their own foundation, relying on the production relations and productive forces created by the new society. Hence, development on one's own foundation signifies that, in this stage, socialism deals with conditions and prerequisites created by itself or, in other words, reproduced by itself.

The CPSU's conclusion on the development of socialism on its own foundation has fundamentally substantiated the tenet that the principles and laws inherent in socialism should be applied more fully and consistently. For instance, theory and practice have proven that, in the stage of developed socialism, it is essential to consistently extend and perfect the basic principle of socialism, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Attempts to ignore this principle and to substitute it by egalitarian distribution can only undermine incentives to progress in socialist society.

The outstanding successes and the problems of socialist construction show how important it is to consistently apply the laws of society's revolutionary transformation, laws brought to light by Marxism, and how dangerous it is to ignore or violate them, to lag behind or outstrip them.

The experience of the socialist countries has confirmed that socialism can triumph and be consolidated only on the basis of a single socio-economic system founded on public ownership of the means of production. But nothing can come of attempts to speed the transition from capitalism and pre-capitalist relations directly to socialism, to prematurely abolish commodity circulation and small-scale private production. We can see how prescient Marx was when he wrote that a more or less long period of transition from capitalism to socialism would be inevitable and necessary. In this context, let us recall the great significance of Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) calling for the gradual pass-

ing through cooperation from small-commodity production to production along socialist lines. This was a matter of the attitude of the working class to the peasantry and other small-commodity producers, of strengthening the alliance with them, of the ways of involving them in the building of socialism.

On the other hand, the notion that socialism can achieve a high level of maturity while preserving a large sector of private, small-commodity production has proved untenable. It is the lesson of both theory and practice that an economy with a multiple structure is typical for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, that socialism cannot be regarded as having been fully and finally established until socialisation of production along the socialist lines had embraced the entire national economy. Mature socialism can develop and perfect itself only on its own basis. In speaking of the significance of abiding by the objective laws of socialist construction, we can refer also to the experience of applying the Marxist theory of reproduction. Stable economic development and the successful solution of social problems can be guaranteed only by determining the optimal growth rates and proportions of the national economy, especially the correlation between the production of means of production and the manufacture of consumer goods. On the contrary, miscalculations in planning and violations of the principles of socialist reproduction and economic proportions in one area or another inescapably create difficulties, undermine economic development, and give rise to dangerous social situations. Consequently, it is vital to elaborate political economy of socialism and consistently abide by objective economic laws in accordance with the specific conditions of each country and every stage of development. This was noted by the 26th Congress of the CPSU. General Secretary Yuri Andropov's article in *Kommunist* also speaks of the insistent need for serious studies of the political economy of socialism. Naturally, further elaboration of political economy must be closely connected with economic policies, with the solving of current economic problems.

In terms of theory and practice, it is important to perfect socialism's political system, to promote socialist democracy in ac-

cordance with the prospects for socialist society's advance towards increasingly fuller implementation of the principles of communist self-government.

Socialism organically combines centralism and democracy, consistently implements administration of state affairs from bottom to top either directly by the masses themselves or through the people's representatives in state administration bodies. The CPSU constantly promotes: optimal interaction of the different elements of the political system; representative and direct democracy; active participation of the masses in governing the state; the work of the Soviets of People's Deputies, the trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organisations and work collectives; enhancement of the people's political and legal knowledge.

That is how we understand the essence of democratic centralism. As experience shows, any deviation from the principle of democratic centralism can cause considerable harm. Any weakening of centralisation can undermine the interests of the people as a whole, and of the state, and can lead to the predominance of parochialism and to the fanning of group claims. Any belittlement or violation of the principles of socialist democracy gives rise to bureaucratic distortions and fetters the creative initiative of the working people. The CPSU is steadfastly guided by Lenin's instructions that socialism and democracy are indivisible, that a high level of organisation and state discipline in socialist society are inconceivable without encouraging the creative initiatives and activities of the people.

Marx and Engels' premise was that the development of democratic principles should be combined with the authority of leaders and executive discipline at all levels. The joint combined activity of many workers in industry, transport, or any other sphere is impossible without organisation, and organisation without discipline, without authority of leaders, and without all the personnel being subordinate to them and to the production rhythm itself. Wanting to abolish authority in large-scale industry is tantamount to wanting to abolish industry itself.¹

¹ See F. Engels, "On Authority", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 377.

Lenin attached major significance to these instructions of the founders of scientific communism. He drew attention to the need for correctly combining democracy and discipline, collective decision-making and one-man management.

Lenin described the socialist society of the future as integral socialism. This is highly important for understanding the issues connected with the further consolidation and perfection of developed socialist society. Speaking of integral socialism, Lenin had in mind its comprehensive character, the proportionality of all its aspects, its completeness, so to say. Hence, it is a question of correspondence between the productive forces and the production relations, between the basis and the superstructure, politics and economy, centralism and democracy, personal interests and the interests of society, ideology and the material conditions of life, human behaviour and the stage of social development, and so on and so forth.

Of course, it is harder to establish a balance between the rapidly changing multiform elements and aspects of the life of society than, say, between chemical elements on laboratory scales. It is only in continuous development of the socialist society that imbalance is done away with and optimal harmony of all the components of social organisation is achieved. Marxism-Leninism has never claimed that a socialist society is an immutable social form. Engels wrote that socialism is not immutable, but is subject to constant flux and change.¹ The actual building of communism is a great historical movement and, like any other movement, it develops through the surmounting of contradictions.

No wonder the relationship between society's socio-political unity and contradictions under socialism, between the nature and forms in which these contradictions manifest themselves and are overcome, has recently become a subject of active discussion. It should be recognised that the elaboration by philosophers of these issues has so far been poor and insufficiently concrete.

Guidelines on these questions are contained in Yuri Andro-

¹ See "Engels to Otto von Boenigk, August 21, 1890", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 485.

pov's above-mentioned article in *Kommunist*. They stem from Lenin's basic tenet that "antagonism and contradiction are not at all one and the same thing. The former will disappear, the latter will remain under socialism". Comrade Andropov cites this tenet and goes on to say: "Now this tenet has been confirmed by practice. It does not follow from this, however, that one can disregard or ignore non-antagonistic contradictions in politics. Life teaches us that even those contradictions which are not by their nature antagonistic can cause serious collisions if disregarded. Another—and the most important—aspect of the matter is correct use of socialism's contradictions as a source and stimulus of its onward development."¹

These considerations should also be underscored, since Lenin's tenets on the dialectics of socialism are sometimes interpreted in an abstract way, outside of time and place, and in some cases one-sidedly. The establishment and development of socialism is a whole historical epoch with its intrinsic stages of advance towards the higher phase of communism. Experience has shown the entry of society into the stage of socialism, the building in the main of socialist society (the building of the foundations of socialism), the complete and final victory of socialism, and the building of developed socialist society, or entry into the stage of mature socialism, to be the major milestones of this epoch. Naturally, in each of these stages society is confronted with specific manifestations of contradictions. Yet at times the approach to their dialectics is, I would say, non-historical, i.e., non-dialectical. For instance, some people misinterpret Lenin's well-known thesis that the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative; and that the struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute.² They invariably regard the development of socialism as simply an aggravation of conflicts and struggle. They reduce the dialectics of the development of socialism in all its stages to a struggle between

¹ See this book, pp. 31-32.

² See V. I. Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, 1980, p. 358.

hostile sides, even though it is absolutely clear from Lenin's "On the Question of Dialectics" that it is a matter of mutually excluding opposites, i.e., essentially antagonistic contradictions. Bearing in mind that Lenin wrote this in 1915, one can readily understand that, politically, these notes were directed against the reformist and compromising concepts of conciliation and cooperation between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

However, juggling quotations, the ideologues of the "cultural revolution" in China declared that antagonisms and the class struggle were inevitable until full communism was built; in this way, they justified the reign of terror and mass pogroms against intellectuals, and especially against administrative personnel, in that country. This was not dialectics, of course, but the worst and most harmful kind of sophistry accommodated to depraved political practice.

Marxism is in principle against reducing dialectics to antagonism of opposing forces, as was done by Dühring and other philosophers of his ilk.

Another extremist view on the experience of socialist construction expounds the dialectics of the establishment and development of socialism as if Russia had never had a civil war or waged a struggle to eliminate the kulaks as a class and to do away with capitalist elements altogether. This view ignores Lenin's instructions that after the revolution triumphs the class struggle does not cease but becomes more violent, and that in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism the class struggle continues until one or the other side wins. Would there be any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat, if after the victory of a socialist revolution there were no forces hostile to socialism and no more antagonistic contradictions between growing socialism and obsolescent capitalism?

We know that some theorists in the communist movement reject, in principle, the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat as the type of state in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Their approach is based on a simplified understanding of the development of socialism; it underestimates the acuteness of the class struggle during the transition to socialism.

All that, in effect, denies the existence of an antagonistic contradiction between the socialist forces and the capitalist elements.

We would do a bad service to our friends by describing the experience of socialist construction one-sidedly, as being something easy, by oversimplifying the dialectics of the development of socialism.

Socialism does not arise ready-made or in a vacuum. At first, non-socialist, capitalist forms of the economy continue to exist alongside the young socialist structure. Consequently, antagonistic contradictions between socialism and capitalist elements, let alone the antagonism between socialism and world capitalism, exist in the society of the transitional period parallel with essentially non-antagonistic contradictions. Bearing this in mind, the CPSU insistently drew attention to the need for revolutionary vigilance against the class enemies of socialism and for a principled policy to overcome their resistance.

With the socialisation of production both in town and countryside, with the laying of the foundation of socialism, the contradictions between the social character of production and private property in the means of production are eliminated, the last exploiter classes and class antagonism disappear. The socialist economic structure becomes fully dominant. The ever-strengthening alliance of the working class with the collective-farm peasantry and also with the closely related working intelligentsia is society's firm social foundation. Yet a mottley conglomerate of elements alien to socialism, e.g., people born into urban and rural bourgeois families, various groups of bourgeois intellectuals, former members of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, members of bourgeois nationalist organisations, etc., still continues to exist. Instigated and supported by imperialists, these hostile elements continue to oppose socialist construction, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is still needed, not only to govern society, but also to crush that opposition.

Naturally, non-antagonistic contradictions also arose and were subsequently overcome. After World War II, i.e., after the socialism built in the USSR had undergone a historic test, we regarded it as a generally recognised truth that contradictions be-

tween the productive forces and production relations could arise in socialist society as well. The CPSU maintained that, with correct policies by the guiding bodies, these contradictions would be successfully resolved, that they would not turn into opposites and develop into a conflict. At the same time, however, the CPSU warned that an incorrect policy might make a conflict inevitable, and that this could turn production relations into a big brake on the productive forces. The Party's attention towards these matters ensured a generally dynamic correspondence of the productive forces and production relations; they did not come into conflict, albeit certain disproportions and fairly big difficulties did show in the economy. The successes in building socialism strengthened the social and internationalist unity of Soviet society and increased the Soviet Union's economic and defence potentials.

It should also be borne in mind that, as the experience of some socialist countries shows, even after the foundations of socialism have been built the possibility of growing activity by anti-socialist forces and of increasing antagonism with them cannot be excluded if vigilance is relaxed, if ties with the masses impaired, and if the policies of the guiding bodies suffer from major miscalculations and distortions. In these conditions, subversive activities by remnants of hostile classes and parties, and also by imperialist subversive centres, may create a threat to the gains of socialism.

Dialectics calls for concrete analysis of a concrete situation. One cannot but see that, in the course of socialist construction in various countries, the acuteness of the struggle between the socialist forces and counter-revolutionary elements largely depends on the nature of the revolutionary process. In countries like Russia, where the transition from the democratic stage of the revolution to its socialist stage took place in the form of an armed uprising and a civil war, where the class enemies of the proletariat were defeated in open battle, and where the Communist Party and the socialist state showed high class vigilance, the construction and development of socialism took place without counter-revolutionary elements daring to start armed action in-

volving a direct confrontation with the socialist state. However, in countries where the democratic revolution developed into a socialist revolution more or less peacefully, the remnants of the exploiter classes and anti-proletarian parties remain relatively potent; if they are able to take advantage of mistakes and weaknesses by the Party and state leadership, there comes a time when they can, with active support from the imperialists, openly attack the foundations of socialism. That happened in Hungary in 1956; that is how events developed in Czechoslovakia in 1968; and that was the cause of the crisis phenomena in Poland in 1980-1981.

The Communists prefer peaceful socialist construction. In principle this is possible, as has been confirmed in a number of countries where the working-class party and socialist state consistently pursue a class policy, skilfully restrict and oust anti-socialist elements, and steadfastly strengthen the positions of socialism.

The experience of the Soviet Union shows that socialist society can be regarded as having reached a qualitatively new level, a historical change when it registers the complete and final victory of socialism, when it attains ideological and political unity. It is with this qualitative change that the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people is connected. Social contradictions of an antagonistic nature no longer exist in society, nor can they.

With the complete and final victory of socialism, and subsequently in developed socialist society, the alliance of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, with the working class having the leading role, becomes stronger than ever as the great motive force in the building of communism.

Hence, our approach to analysing contradictions in the socialist society must be historical, i.e., dialectical, so as to reveal their specific features in each stage of society's development.

Developed socialism is a new, natural stage on the road to communism. In concretising historical reference points in the further advance of Soviet society, Comrade Andropov has em-

phasised that the USSR is presently at the beginning of this long historical stage, which will have its own periods and stages of growth. The developed socialism built in the USSR is not a fully finished social form free of all disproportions, difficulties and shortcomings. A socialist society developing on its own foundation still encounters "birth marks" of capitalism, as Marx forewarned.

The most persistent contradiction is the one between socialist reality and its corresponding ideology, on the one hand, and survivals of capitalism in human consciousness and behaviour, on the other. One cannot wave this issue aside just because capitalism has long since been done away with in the USSR. One should, first of all, bear in mind that to us capitalism is not only the past but also a living enemy doing its best to influence our people. Secondly, one must take into account the exceptional tenacity of tradition and social inertia. Marx said that the traditions of the past generations weigh upon the minds of the living like a nightmare. The remaking of the consciousness of working people, including that of the working class, their vanguard, is a lengthy and complex process.

Survivals of the capitalist mentality adapt themselves to new conditions, taking reincarnated forms. Private ownership of the means of production has been eliminated, but the individualism, egoism and philistinism which it has engendered continue to influence the minds and behaviour of persons who lack ideological stability. This gives rise to cupidity, money-grubbing, a slipshod attitude to the job at socialist enterprises, and stealing of social property. Miscalculations and mistakes in economic activity and ideological and political work can contribute to a spread of these anti-social manifestations. One should therefore not reckon on these negative features disappearing automatically as socialism advances. Obsolete and alien views and traits can stay dormant and can also revive in the absence of persistent, systematic counter-measures: weeds can choke a ploughed field, too, if it is neglected. To overcome everything obsolete, everything that impedes progress, is a pressing demand of socialist theory and practice.

Contradictions of real life are not only inhibitors of progress but, also, first of all, one of its sources. For example, the contradiction between the new, on the one hand, and the established, on the other. If not for such contradictions there would have been no further progress. This can clearly be seen in science and technology, where advancement depends chiefly on support of everything new and progressive, and on overcoming conservatism, inertness and stagnation. The same applies to all spheres of the life of society. No wonder contradictions between the new and the old, and conflicts between innovators and conservatives, hold such an important place in the literature of socialist realism.

The Central Committee of the CPSU stresses that the main content of the work of the Party and Soviet people is to perfect developed socialism, to overcome difficulties and resolve new issues, to make further advances. The paramount task of the social sciences is to analyse new possibilities and new sources and motive forces for the progress of socialist society.

Existing socialism is the most dynamic social system. It is full of energy and is capable of impressive historical accomplishments. The achievements made by socialist countries in the socio-economic sphere, in raising the people's cultural level and living standards, strikingly illustrate the new system's inexhaustible potentialities and its indisputable advantages over capitalism. The combining of these advantages with the advances of the scientific and technological revolution promotes socialist society's further progress. The CPSU attaches enormous significance to the practical application of Marx's well-known proposition on turning science into a direct productive force.

According to Engels, every new discovery in any theoretical field made Marx truly happy; and especially so when a discovery had an immediate revolutionising impact on industry and on historical development in general. Science does not become a direct productive force by itself but only when its achievements are embodied in the means of production, in production methods, and then in the creation of material values. The conversion of science into a direct productive force through the practical application of its achievements becomes a constructive mass

social movement involving each working person and the entire people.

Marx and Engels clearly perceived the interconnection of science, technology and economy. They had a comprehensive understanding of the way that economic relations depend on the level of the productive forces, and especially on advances in science and technology, and vice versa.

It is very important to continue these traditions of the founders of scientific communism in this respect and, among other things, to actively develop technical and economic studies in the light of the political economy of socialism. One must admit that this trend in research has not received due attention. In his time, Marx drew attention to the importance of quantitative analysis in economics, and provided models for such analysis. Following them, Soviet economists have started using mathematical methods in economics. However, whereas mathematical studies in economics have intensified in recent years, this cannot be said of economic analyses of scientific and technological progress. There was a time when many Soviet institutes for research in the natural and applied sciences set up economics sections and planned measures to coordinate technical and economic studies; however, this important work was not carried further. Today, technical and economic feasibility calculations are carried out for development projects, but there are still far from enough feasibility studies relating to scientific and technological progress on the scale of the national economy as a whole. Economics research institutions must not delay in showing greater initiative and activity in this vitally important field.

On both the theoretical and practical planes it is important to emphasise Marx's brilliant idea that science is the fruit of common effort and belongs to all mankind. Attempts by the US imperialists and their allies to break off international ties, to organise a scientific and technological blockade of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, and to pursue an isolationist policy in science are tantamount to undermining the foundations of scientific development and the overall creative potential of civilised mankind. However, this short-sighted US

policy will undoubtedly be frustrated by the realities of life because it contradicts the laws of the development of science.

The century since the death of Karl Marx has witnessed the complete triumph of his theory, further developed by Lenin and his other followers. In this period the emancipation and liberation movements inspired by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism have changed the world beyond recognition. The main events of the 20th century have been: the Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR; the defeat of fascism in World War II; the victory of socialism in a number of countries and the establishment of the world socialist system; the strengthening of the positions and role of the working class in capitalist countries; the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism; the massive scale of the national liberation struggle of peoples.

The historical experience of the 20th century has shown most convincingly that capitalism is in all respects the main inhibitor of progress, the most serious obstacle in the way of resolving mankind's fundamental social problems—problems which the socialist countries have either resolved or are in the process of resolving. Capitalism is to blame for the fact that in the greater part of the world remains increasing exploitation of man by man, oppression because of race or nationality, growing international tensions and the threat of war, and the worsening of all the global problems.

The theoretical guidelines laid down by Marx and creatively amplified by Lenin in the new historical conditions make possible a scientific assessment of the main development trends in capitalist society. Ever since the Great October Socialist Revolution capitalism's main contradiction—between labour and capital—has grown both in scale and in depth, first as a global contradiction between two systems, and second as a contradiction in capitalist society itself between the huge majority of the working population and the monopolies. A new element of this contradiction is the antagonism between the dependent countries and the imperialist centres pursuing a neocolonialist policy. Lastly,

the scientific and technological revolution is also shattering the social foundations of modern capitalism.

Marx's theoretical legacy on the problems of scientific and technological progress under capitalism is the key to a scientific analysis of the nature and social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution in the current stage of the development of state-monopoly capitalism and the transnational corporations. The scientific and technological revolution multiplies the material prerequisites for the transition from capitalism to socialism; it leads to a higher level of socialisation and internationalisation of production and aggravates the contradictions between the social nature of the productive forces and capitalist property.

The growth of this entire range of contradictions is eroding the foundations of capitalism and intensifying and deepening its general crisis.

The teachings of Marx and Lenin on the cyclic nature of the capitalist economic development enable us to make a comprehensive analysis of the key problems of the present economic crisis in the capitalist system: of inflation, unemployment and the other incurable ills. Very significant in this context are the major Marxist-Leninist conclusions about the destructive effects of the militarisation of the capitalist economy, which has today assumed extremely dangerous proportions.

Marx paid special attention to the role of the bourgeois state in relation to the functioning of its economy, notably its policy of protectionism, its tax policy, and so on. Continuing Marx's analysis in the 20th century, Lenin showed that the state and the capitalist monopolies were merging, and laid bare the principal features of state-monopoly capitalism.

Marx and Engels noted that the concentration of production leads to monopoly, to the ruin and ousting of small producers. However, monopoly does not eliminate competition, but, being its antagonist, coexists with it.¹

¹ See K. Marx and F. Engels, "The Poverty of Philosophy", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 195-96.

In analysing the dominance of monopolies under imperialism, and in characterising imperialism as monopoly capitalism, Lenin emphasised that such capitalism is a mixture of free competition and monopoly.¹ Monopolies which have grown out of free competition, do not eliminate it but exist above it and alongside it giving thereby rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts.² There has never been such a thing as total monopoly capitalism; the monopolies exist alongside private enterprises, alongside the market, competition and crises. Lenin wrote: "...it is this combination of antagonistic principles, viz., competition and monopoly, that is the essence of imperialism, it is this that is making for the final crash, i.e., the socialist revolution."³

The scientific and political aspects of state-monopoly regulation of the economy have today become particularly topical. The crisis of bourgeois methods of regulation is growing increasingly deeper, but the ruling classes still have considerable potentialities and, naturally, no intention of voluntarily relinquishing power or the economic levers for stabilising it.

Guided by the ideas of the founders of scientific communism and by the experience of the world socialist system, the working class and its Communist Party map out their socio-economic programmes to promote the interests of the majority of the working people and the transition to socialism.

The main feature of our time is the growing polarisation of social forces both on the world scene and within the capitalist system itself, and also the increasingly acute struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between the forces of peace and imperialist aggression. World socialism and the international working class are the main bulwark of historical progress. The shift by the ruling circles in imperialist countries to the right, towards reaction, militarism and aggression, is coun-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, 1974, p. 219.

² See *ibid.*, p. 266.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 465.

terposed by the growing struggle of the democratic forces against monopoly capital and its reactionary home and foreign policies.

The collapse of the colonial empires was accompanied by the emergence of dozens of new states formed after the liberated peoples had separated from their imperialist metropolitan countries. Yet the free national development and social progress of most of these young states are encountering stubborn resistance from imperialist powers, which, supported by domestic reaction, pursue a policy of neocolonialism. The prospects of nations voluntarily uniting, the prospects of mankind's international consolidation, depend on success by the peoples in their struggle against imperialism, for complete political and economic independence, and for the all-round development of nations and national cultures. Lenin wrote: "In the same way as mankind can arrive at the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, it can arrive at the inevitable integration of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede."¹

The imperialists are doing their utmost to split the liberated peoples, set them against one another and to turn them against socialist countries, and to implant anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in the developing countries. However, the fundamental interests of the developing countries are opposed to the policy of imperialism and make them aware of the need for closer fruitful ties with socialist countries and the international workers' movement.

Another sign of the times is the fact that a number of young national states have taken a socialist orientation, thus reaffirming the propositions of Marx and Lenin that, given the support of socialist countries, it is possible for formerly backward peoples gradually to move towards socialism without passing through the capitalist stage.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 147.

Thus, the present processes of the world's social renewal and the formation of the new, communist social system are an expression of the universal world law of development revealed by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

As it develops and perfects itself, world socialism is making an inestimable contribution to mankind's historic progress, thereby demonstrating the viability of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx's memory is revered by the working masses of the world. His teaching and his cause live on and continue to exert a powerful influence on social thought and the onward march of human society.

There is little wonder that Marx's doctrine has constantly evoked fierce hostility from the bourgeoisie and its ideologues, for it not only predicts the inevitable collapse of capitalism but also arms the working class with a weapon in its struggle for the revolutionary remaking of society.

Ever since it was conceived Marxism has had numerous critics who counterposed it with their ideological concepts designed to "edify" humankind. All their concepts have disappeared from the historical scene without a trace, and the course of history continues in accordance with Marx, under the banner of Marxism. An acute struggle is still going on around Marx's ideological legacy. Its present-day opponents are suffering one defeat after another. Bourgeois and revisionist ideologues have repeatedly declared Marxism a "dead", "ossified" and "stiff" doctrine that has lost its efficacy in a changed world. But the fact that these ideologues constantly harp on this merely confirms that Marx's doctrine is alive and active, is developing creatively and is increasingly influential the world over. It is also characteristic that, in recent years, theorists of social reformism have been turning ever more often to Marx, whom they had previously rejected as "outdated" and had "refuted".

None of the reformist, revisionist theories have led in practice to a society different from capitalist society. Marxism-Leninism was the sole theory in accordance with which a considerable part of mankind emerged from the capitalist framework to build a new, socialist society, and in accordance with which a transition

from capitalism to socialism is now taking place on a world-wide scale.

The social realities of our day set Marxism apart from all the other philosophical, sociological, economic and political doctrines as a teaching distinguished for its uniquely powerful scientific prevision, its correctness, its social and historical role and its magnetic force.

Marxism, creatively developed and enriched by Lenin and other continuers of Marx's cause, is more than a sphere of scientific knowledge and study of social practice. Through the Marxist-Leninist policies and practices of working-class revolutionary parties, scientific socialism is being materialised in the working people's class struggle and in the practical building of socialism and communism. As a result, social science is being substantially enriched by the practice of each of these parties and nations.

Today we have every right to say that the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin have entered the international communist movement as the sole scientific world view of the working class. We believe this is the reason why the movement is successfully fulfilling its function as the most influential political force of modern times in the struggle for peace and socialism, and against imperialism. We see in this an earnest of the solidity of the fraternal links between the working people of all countries, of the effectiveness of proletarian internationalism, which is greatly enhancing the influence of the working class in every country and on the world scene.

Marxism-Leninism is the common property of the international working class, of all adherents of socialism. It is developing and being enriched through the joint, collective creative efforts of the communist and workers' parties and through the contribution being made to it by each party, by teams of scientists and by individual theorists. Neither this doctrine as a whole nor any of its component parts or propositions can be a national or a continental monopoly. Marxist studies of world-wide or national processes are always internationalist regardless of where or by whom they are conducted. There can be no national or

regional Marxist philosophy, political economy or socialist theory. In this respect, Marxism-Leninism does not differ from mathematics, physics, biology, chemistry or any other science.

What gives Marxism-Leninism its greatness and unfading internationalist significance is the fact that it brought to light the underlying social development trends and patterns operating in all periods of world history, including capitalism, the period of its revolutionary replacement by socialism, and the advance of socialist society to its higher phase, communism. The internationalist significance of Marx's ideas also lies in that they gave the working class a powerful instrument of knowledge enabling it to find solutions to the social problems that arise along the difficult, multiform, and unexplored road to communism. Marx's doctrine has been, and continues to be, the lodestar for generations of revolutionaries, for fighters against capitalism and imperialism, and for the builders of socialism and communism in all the countries of the world.

Understandably, there can be no compromises or ideological-theoretical concessions, concerning the scientific validity of Marxism. Departures from the teachings of Marx and Lenin are an ideological rupture with their cause, with the cause of the socialist revolution and communism. Together with the other fraternal parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union safeguards the purity of Marxist theory, repulsing every attempt to distort its class and scientific essence and sweeping away accretions that are alien to its revolutionary-critical spirit.

The present-day scale of revolutionary actions and, correspondingly, of Marxist studies is extremely broad, varied and wide-ranging. Our epoch is distinguished by great historical dynamism, extraordinary diversity and contradictory social processes. It is an epoch of fundamental changes in the foundations of society's life. As the sphere of the world's revolutionary renewal broadens, more countries take the road of socialist transformation in new, often substantially different, historical conditions. Hence, an exact repetition of the concrete historical forms of transition to socialism which have ensured its triumph in one country or another is impossible. The generalisation of the spe-

cific forms of advance towards socialism is the central theoretical prerequisite for directing the various present-day revolutionary streams into the socialist channel. The greater the understanding of the diversity of the specific forms of transition to socialism in the context of the general regularities of the establishment of the communist social system, the easier and surer will our theoretical thought identify new potentialities of the revolutionary process in the social movements of the masses in different countries.

Uneven socio-economic and political development leaves its imprint on the communist, working-class and national liberation movements. We see how different are the problems being resolved even by parties belonging to one and the same revolutionary stream, whether in socialist or capitalist countries. We see the great diversity in tackling similar problems. Much that is new and creative is produced by the social practice of the people in each socialist country, by cooperation among them in carrying out common and national tasks of socio-economic development. As it approaches the third millennium, mankind encounters global problems that likewise manifest themselves in their own way in countries with different social systems and dissimilar levels of economic development—problems of energy, food, ecology, raw materials and the use of scientific and technological achievements. A large spectrum of problems is created for the Communists by the economic crisis gripping the capitalist world and also by the efforts to establish a new world economic order. It is increasingly important to achieve more effective political interaction between the different revolutionary forces, notably, world socialism, the working-class movement and the national liberation struggle against imperialism.

In revealing the conditions, factors and means of emancipating the working class, Marx drew the fundamental conclusion that neither a successful struggle against capitalism nor the attainment of the communist ideal is conceivable without unity among the workers of all nationalities, races and countries. Consistent internationalism is the keynote not only of the theory but also of the entire political practice of Marxism. Without this

the working-class movement loses its effectiveness. Marx cautioned that the price of disunity could be a bitter general defeat.

Lenin adopted Marx's proletarian internationalism as the basic principle of the revolutionary policy of the communist vanguard, and developed it in conformity with the epoch of imperialism and transition from capitalism to socialism. Proletarian internationalism is the immutable foundation of the work of the CPSU. Guided by its principles, the CPSU steadfastly urges broader co-operation, unity, and solidarity among the fraternal communist and workers' parties in their common struggle for peace and socialism. Proletarian internationalism is the criterion by which the CPSU collates its strategy of communist construction and its foreign policy line. Proletarian internationalism motivates its many-sided support for the peoples fighting for freedom, independence and social progress.

Today, a hundred years after Karl Marx, we see the invincible power of his theory in its full stature, and the indivisible link of this theory with the liberation movement of our time. The Communists see the further broad dissemination of Marxism-Leninism among the masses as an effective means of winning the peoples over to socialism, to the great communist ideals.

Thanks to the influence of Marxism-Leninism and to the fact that it has become the living history of existing socialism, the following three ideas are paramount in our time:

- the idea of social equality and all-round development of the individual on the basis of the socialist way of life;
- the idea of national liberation and free national development towards social progress;
- the idea of lasting and inviolable peace among nations.

The progressive mankind is approaching the turn of the century and the turn of the millennium under the banner of these ideas.

History is demonstrating the truth of Engels' prophetic words about Marx: "His name will endure through the ages, and so also will his work!"

RICHARD KOSOLAPOV

Dr. Sc. (Phil.)

Editor-in-Chief of "Kommunist"

MARX IS ALWAYS ABREAST OF THE TIMES

The works of Marx, which are in themselves a scientific achievement that is a gigantic whole, transcend the immediate needs of the class struggle of the proletariat for which they had been created. By his thorough and consummate analysis of the capitalist economy and, indeed, the historical method of research with its immeasurably broad sphere of application, Marx has produced much more than is directly necessary for the practical class struggle.

Rosa LUXEMBURG

Marx is unfathomably profound and invariably in step with the times.

Marx's ideological legacy never grows old.

Marx always has a word that seems to have been spoken today.

Today, too, Marx stands in the forefront of the fighters for the social remaking of the world.

No matter what combination of words we may choose—the above or one of a countless number of others—to express the everlasting relevance, the *eternal modernity* of Marx's thought, we will always be well advised to back them with an authentic, precise, thorough and concrete exposition of the Marxian truths.

First, it is essential that, despite the avalanche of information, the numbers of those who read Marx *himself* rather than popular paraphrases of his works, should grow continuously.

Second, none should discount the fact, that the extraordinary methodological power of Marx's genius was the battering ram which the fortress walls of bourgeois apologetics and the towers of positivist scholasticism have failed to withstand despite decades of desperate counter-attacks. Bourgeois social science, too, has in its own way succumbed to its forceful influence. Nowadays, even those who savagely hate Marx the revolutionary tend to confess reverence for Marx the scholar and researcher. No few quasi-objective authors, all of them faithful watchdogs of the capitalist class, will gladly play to the grandstands and join in singing the praises of the great author of *Capital*. Their motivations may differ, but the object of their paeans is to obfuscate the rebel essence of Marxism, to drown it in a stream of praises and compliments, and to stow away its maker more securely among the waxworks in Madame Tussaud's museum.

There is also a side-effect. The compliments of a reactionary are like the kiss of Judas. Indeed, they are made mostly with the intent of creating a false impression, of causing speculation about the person to whom they are addressed. It is, therefore, never amiss to recall Lessing's verse which Lenin cited in relation to Marx: "Who would not praise a Klopstock? But will everybody read him? No. We would like to be exalted less, but [to be] read more diligently!"¹

It is a tradition by now to exhort the image of Prometheus in describing the momentous role that Marx has played in the history of the human spirit. The example of that titan who stole fire from the gods for the use of men, who gave them the light and warmth of fire as the earnest of the light and warmth of the spirit, and who suffered for it, had indeed inspired Marx. Still, what Marx himself accomplished is far greater than the Promethean tale of the ancient Greeks. Marx gave the proletariat, the peoples, all humanity, what neither Prometheus nor any other hero could have given them: a precise knowledge of themselves, and thereby the knowledge of how to achieve liberation. He gave

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, 1977, p. 134.

them what they could not have borrowed from anyone, something that had not existed before, something that had had to be *created from scratch*. Nothing in all history that preceded Marx's feat is even remotely comparable to the Marxian doctrine. "The philosophy which Marx gave the working class was a revolution in the history of social thought," wrote Yuri Andropov in his article, "Karl Marx's Teaching and Some of the Problems in the Building of Socialism in the USSR". And he amplified: "Humanity did not even know a fraction as much about itself as it has learnt thanks to Marxism. Marx's teaching, presented in the organic integrity of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory of scientific communism, was a real revolution in world outlook and simultaneously illuminated the road to the most profound social revolutions."

The edifice of Marxism is grand. And one can hardly become a learned Marxist by reading some one book, be it ever so consummate and well written. It is the inevitable destiny of Marxism to be systematically and thoroughly studied by an ever greater number of people, to function ceaselessly in the constructive revolutionary endeavours of the masses, and to be continuously enriched by the accumulating material of science and life. That is its true being, incompatible with any and all dogmatism.

Some say to us Communists: "Can it be right today, at the end of the 20th century, to follow a doctrine formulated over a century ago?" But in substance they offer no valid alternative. Nor can they offer one. The argument of Marxism's age is, as a rule, brought forth by those who would entice humanity with a butterfly chase after all sorts of lightweight concepts spawned without surcease by bourgeois social thought and which Lenin described as stillborn fads. Can the age of the truth affect its veracity? Is it not the other way round? The more conclusively the truth is confirmed, the more valuable it becomes. No, Marxists do not cling to the various particulars in Marx's doctrine which are naturally subject to the erosion of time. No, they do not insist on the purely fortuitous assessments of events that have faded into the past. But they know well the power of the Marxist dialectico-materialist method. They have learned from

experience that this method is the prime spiritual gain of the millennia of human history. And the worth of the method is, in principle, the worth of the pertinent theory.

To show the topicality of Marx's doctrine it is not at all necessary to find some new or not as yet thoroughly studied chapters of it. It is better, so it seems, to follow a more familiar, though always new, path—to again elucidate those of the provisions that are seemingly known to all and that remain irrefutable and relevant. So, in order to limit and specify the topic of this article, let me name the three aspects of Marxism which will be treated in it and which are representative of it.

What are these aspects?

First, the Marxist concept of the alienation and exploitation of man by man, which is, in effect, the sentence that science has passed on capitalism.

Second, the Marxist concept of the world-historical mission of the working class, the social force that is called upon to carry that sentence into effect and to take the lead in building a new society.

Third, the vitality of Marx's ideas, their scientific efficacy in analysing the already shaped and wholly consolidated socialism as a social system.

Before tackling the first of the questions listed above, let me recall Engels's well-known thought that *Marxism found the key to the understanding of the whole history of society in the history of the development of labour.*¹

Labour, the essential elements of which, according to Marx, are purposeful activity, means of labour, and the object of labour, is the labourer's action on some natural substance with the purpose of giving it the form desired by man. Through labour, in one way or another, man reveals and develops his nature. We judge of the maker by his product, because in it he has partially "objectified" himself, having given that external object something

¹ See F. Engels, "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 376.

of his internal self. This transfer of subjective aptitudes to the object, their conversion from something intrinsically lodged in the subject into properties of an external object, expresses the general distinctiveness of labour. Adaptation of the object to human needs would be simply impossible without it. But the consumption of the product thus created, that is, returning to the labourer what he has given the object in the process of his labour, is the reverse appropriation by man of his "essential powers", impelling his continuously repeated assertion of himself as the subject of production. This process is in the nature of an assimilation, a "subjectification", of the object which is, by itself, an important premise of the "objectification". What we see in life is their close interlacement, their mutual penetration and mutual conditioning.

Though they are closely linked and though they presuppose each other, the above elements of human activity differ and are frequently divided in time and space. The act of "objectifying" the subject in labour may be pried away or separated from the act of assimilation, of "subjectifying" the product of labour. This specificity of labour—the objective demarcation between manufacturing and consuming, between giving and assimilating—makes it possible, indeed, to delay the return to the producer of his product in a society based on private property.

Man's "objectification" of his aptitudes in the process of labour (the subject-object relationship) will exist as long as there is social production. As for the withdrawal of the material embodiment, the condensation, of labour, of its product, in favour of the non-labourer—and that, precisely, is the *social alienation* in the relations between men—it arose at a definite stage in the development of society, and is of a transient, temporary, though long-term, character.

In the primordial community, which had exceedingly primitive implements and was barely able to produce enough to sustain its members, there could be no question of alienating the products of labour. The poorly developed productive forces, the low productivity of labour, the limited practice and the ignorance of social and natural laws, made man wholly dependent on na-

ture. In addition, there was his rigid dependence on the community itself. And that community was anything but a free association of harmoniously developed individuals. It was a collective of weak and defenceless creatures who derived their modicum of strength to fight for survival against nature exclusively through association with their like. There was no alienation simply because there was nothing to alienate and no one to alienate anything.

Private property and slavery came when the productivity of labour rose high enough to provide a certain amount of surplus products over and above the minimum required to sustain life. This surplus it was that became subject to alienation. And a group of persons (which consolidated itself as the exploiting class) claimed property because it turned people, the labourers, into its possession, and likened them to implements of labour. The same state of affairs was seen under feudalism. The only difference was that here the person of the peasant was dependent on the feudal lord as an appendage to the land and to the farming tools that were the latter's property.

In the capitalist environment, the labourer is no longer dependent and can no longer be anyone's property. But he is deprived of the means of production. He gains personal freedom, but without its material basis—a freedom that is no more than illusory because he remains economically dependent on the owner of the means and objects of labour. The product of labour, which goes to the proprietor of the means of production rather than to the labourer who produces it, confronts labour “as *something alien*, as a *power independent* of the producer”, with the result that this “realisation of labour appears as *loss of realisation* for the workers; objectification as *loss of the object and bondage to it*”.¹

What the worker produces does not decrease but rather increases the power that dominates and enslaves him. As Marx wrote in the original version of *Capital*, the “stress is laid not on the *objectification* but on the *estrangement*, the *alienation*, the

¹ K. Marx, “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 272.

separation, on the possession of enormous objectified power which social labour has itself opposed to itself as one of its properties—on the possession of this power not by the worker but by the personified conditions of production, that is, by capital”.¹ The product of labour, the thing created by man’s hands, begins to dominate man. “The more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself”,² and the poorer he becomes both materially and spiritually.

Long before the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin made use of a study of the factories and mills in Russia to show the ratio between the profit of the capitalist and the wages of a proletarian. At that time workers numbered 2,250,000, earning an annual 555,700,000 roubles. The average annual wage was 246 roubles (20.50 roubles a month). The capitalists’ profits totalled an annual 568,700,000 roubles. In other words, every worker yielded the capitalist a profit of 252 roubles or more than he received himself. “It follows,” Lenin wrote, “that the worker works *the lesser part* of the day for himself and *the greater part* of it for the capitalist.”³

The contrasts are far more startling in our time. In the mid-19th century a worker in the USA worked something like three-fifths of the time for himself and two-fifths for the capitalist, whereas a hundred years later he spent two-thirds of the time making surplus value and worked only one-third of the time for himself. In the third quarter of the 20th century the physical gap between the average income of the employer and the average wage widened three-fold in the USA, six-fold in France, and ten-fold in Japan. The degree of exploitation was especially great in fields most strongly influenced by the scientific and technical revolution and in which the percentage of skilled workers

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Moscow, 1939, S. 716.

² K. Marx, “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 272.

³ V. I. Lenin, “Workers’ Earnings and Capitalist Profits in Russia”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, 1973, p. 257.

was higher. As he creates some relatively modest base for his own wellbeing, the proletariat simultaneously creates an at best equal (but as a rule greater) economic base for being exploited.

Visible changes occurred in the internal life of the economically developed capitalist states after the first, and especially the second, world war. The scientific and technical progress coupled with the powerful influence of the socialist world system, and the increased economic, political and ideological struggle of the proletariat which had become conscious of the backing of socialism that was organised as a state, had the beneficial effect of restraining the exploiters in the Western industrial states from encroaching on the minimal means of subsistence of the employed worker. The slightly higher income of the working people in physical terms gave monopoly propaganda cause to claim that the Marxian theory of the exploitation of the working class has been laid low. These claims repose on the banal fact that the conditions of capitalist production in the last few decades of the 20th century are not the same as those analysed by Marx. The old story which our adversaries prefer not to remember is repeating itself: an assault has been mounted against Marxism, much like the one mounted after Engels's death by number one revisionist Bernstein; specifically, it is spearheaded against the "theory of impoverishment", which is being dished up in a distorted, exaggerated form.

Take the current situation in the geographically peripheral regions of the capitalist world, that is, in countries which are the object of exploitation by developed imperialist states and by transnational corporations. Despite the collapse of the colonial system, capital is as brusque as ever there and has not abandoned the old methods of extracting profits. The liberated countries are still, in effect, imperialism's raw materials appendages. Ninety per cent of Japan's raw materials and 75 per cent of Western Europe's come from Asia, Africa and Latin America. With three times the population, the newly free countries produce only one-sixth as much as the industrialised capitalist states, and per capita only one-sixteenth. On average, the wage of skilled workers in Asia is one-tenth that of their counterparts in the USA.

The mechanism of impoverishment in the economically developed capitalist states, as distinct from that in the developing countries, has become more intricate and recondite. The fairly high per capita consumption figures help to disguise the fact that, as Lenin put it, "poverty grows, not in the physical but in the social sense, i.e., in the sense of the disparity between the increasing level of consumption by the bourgeoisie and consumption by society as a whole, and the level of the living standards of the working people".¹

There is no denying that compared with prewar, wage workers in the developed capitalist countries are more prosperous as a result of the scientific and technical progress, the pressure of the organised struggle of the proletariat, and the development of socialism in a number of countries. There is also no denying, however, that in the same period the profits of capitalist monopolies have risen incommensurably higher than the incomes of the working people. This alone leads to absolutely clear conclusions. The first (and simplest) is that exploitation of the industrial work force has intensified, because the share of the social wealth pocketed by capitalists cannot grow in any other way.

New methods of exploitation have arisen alongside the old, and these new methods have created new forms of impoverishment of the mass of the people.

The progressive use in production of the achievements of science and technology is rapidly pushing up the percentage of labour by brain, leading to a certain intellectualisation of labour. Under capitalism this means that *the mental rather than physical aptitudes of the worker are gradually and increasingly becoming the object of exploitation*. Knowledge of this new source of profit visibly enriches the Marxist conception of the mechanism of capitalist oppression of the masses and alienation of labour.

The role and weight of the workers by brain (the intelligentsia) as an object of exploitation is increasing. This means that

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Review. *Karl Kautsky. Bernstein und das sozialdemokratische Programm. Eine Antikritik*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1977, p. 201.

the labour of ever new groups of producers is being absorbed by the sphere of exploitation. This adds to the opportunities for ever broader use in industrially developed capitalist countries of forms of social oppression that repose on re-orienting of exploitation, which had in the past chiefly exhausted the workers' muscle, on wearing out the nervous system, less noticeable to the workers but more productive for the exploiters.

Having "discovered" a new, more effective source of profit in the increasing exploitation of the mental energy of workers, capitalism found that it will be contrary to its interests to reduce their consumption of products meeting physical and elementary cultural demands. More: since nowadays, given up-to-date technology, much more profit is being "squeezed" out of proficiency rather than muscular strength, the monopoly tycoons prefer to deal with a well nourished and mostly semi-intellectual worker. And all this in the presence, perhaps even aggravation, of capitalism's habitual blights—those of mass unemployment, destitution, malnutrition, and poverty in the immediate sense, contrasted by the show-window splendours of the bourgeois world.

In some cases, to suit its egoistic interests, the bourgeoisie may even have a stake in meeting the standard demands of the masses more fully. But *the newly arising needs*, which grow swiftly owing to the general rise of education and the *scientific and technical revolution*, are left outside the bounds of these standard demands. Capital sees the increasing economic "returns" from the new aptitudes, and seeks to profit from freezing the notion of demands by all means (including the ideological).

The limitation of the working people's consumption does not end any more than exploitation. Now it is directed above all to limiting the *social* development of the exploited, though such development is becoming a necessary consequence and condition of successful production. Nothing but the absence so far of any *immediate quantitative* measure of the extent to which social demands are met enables the bourgeoisie to conceal the "secret" of exploitation as practised in the latter half of the 20th century. Bourgeois propagandists make the most of this, too, referring to capitalism's allegedly greater ability to raise the standard of liv-

ing; in doing so, they base their arguments exclusively on a comparison of the *physical volume* of products consumed in the industrially developed Western powers and in some of the socialist states. This social demagoguery distracts the attention of a considerable segment of people in the capitalist countries from the *increasing social and cultural under-consumption among the working people*, and obfuscates the considerable *lag in the development of the personality* of each behind the opportunities that are *already created* for this by modern production.

The inclusion in the value of labour power of considerable sums to cover the wide range of new social and cultural demands that capitalism fails to satisfy, speaks of the need for changing the concept of "social poverty". *In some countries today, capitalism can avoid profiting from any obvious malnutrition of the masses, though it is not likely to ignore any suitable opportunity for doing so. But it increasingly prefers to profit from their chronic spiritual starvation. Only the form of alienation has changed, its essence is the same.*

Man does not live by bread alone. This old adage has never been more relevant than it is today. In addition to a certain degree of prosperity, the present state of the productive forces predicates a high cultural and technical standard for industrial workers. The demands whose satisfaction capitalism impeded a century ago and the demands which it fails to satisfy today in order to obtain a higher profit differ in origin, form and the objects on which they focus. But they are equally vital for the individual *if he or she are to measure up to the level of present-day cultural-historical development*. The change in the form and focus of exploitation does not in the least alter the Marxist concept of the alienation of labour. On the contrary, it offers new evidence of its validity.

In the environment of scientific and technical revolution, capitalist production has created a large mass of people whose situation is that of proletarians but who are in effect workers by brain. More and more surplus value is being squeezed out of their intellectual capacities. At the same time, capitalist production creates a vast and continuously growing world of spiritual

demands that are no longer the privilege of a restricted, essentially bourgeois, minority, and have become the aim and purpose of the life of this new, numerous army of exploited. A front of protest and struggle is building up against the bourgeois social system which, having brought into being new demands, fails to provide conditions for their satisfaction by the bulk of the people. Because the immediate purpose of the capitalist mode of production—that of increasing value—is out of step with the absolute purpose of production, that of producing objects to satisfy human needs. *The crisis of the bourgeois mode of production is also becoming a crisis of spiritual production.* Dissatisfaction and protest is spreading not only among those engaged in manual labour, but also among those engaged in labour by brain. Capitalism's chief contradiction is becoming increasingly universal not only in principle, but also in practice.

The technical conditions of production, impelled by the scientific and technical revolution, are clearly maturing to make labour free and creative—not merely an appeaser of the hungers of the flesh but also those of the spirit. This is happening in the framework of modern capitalist production, but the need for it is in principle unappeasable under the bourgeois system. It is on the order of the day to create the social conditions for appeasing this need—above all by wiping out exploitation, which is possible only through the victory of socialism.

The constant alienation of the products of labour, the main result and condensation of human activity, was for Marx a transformation of that activity into a process that did not belong to man, into a ceaseless "self-alienation" of the process of labour. "The worker therefore," he wrote, "only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He feels at home when he is not working, and when he is working he does not feel at home. His labour is therefore not voluntary, but coerced; it is *forced labour*. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a *means* to satisfy needs external to it."¹ Since it does

¹ K. Marx, "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 274.

not belong to the worker but to the capitalist, his activity is not a self-activity but "is the loss of his self".¹ That is why *the exploitative system cultivates the feeling that labour is a foreign obligation unworthy of man*. The loathing of working for an exploiter is sometimes carried over to any labour. The material alienation of the product and the process of labour leads thus to the worker's moral alienation from all labour.

Life in production, Marx says, is a specific type of life activity typical of the human species alone, the species-life of men as social creatures. Alienation of labour is therefore also alienation of man's species-life, of the social principle, while the forced character of labour makes the intrinsically human form of life activity a mere means of sustaining the physical existence. Exploitation leaves man empty, makes him foreign to his own essential being, to labour. His life activity, his labour, loses its independent meaning and value if it does not hold a promise of some immediate utilitarian result. This entrenches man's dependence on basically his physical (in origin animal) needs.

"An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labour, from his life activity, from his species-being," Marx wrote, "is the *estrangement of man from man*. When man confronts himself, he confronts the *other man*. What applies to a man's relation to his work, to the product of his labour and to himself, also holds of a man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labour and object of labour."²

The reproduction of the basis of alienation by the modern capitalist system and the simultaneous evolution of bourgeois society piles more and more contradictions one upon the other. Economic partitions between individuals have become a norm. Alienation has many faces. It arises between young and old, the educated and the semi-educated, between husband and wife, white and "coloured", those who work and those who study, between persons doing creative and non-creative work, the managers and

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, p. 277.

the living robots, civilians and soldiers, "doves" and "hawks", and so on. And the ruling elite makes the most of this diversity. It treats the ills of bourgeois society in two ways—resorting to local anaesthetics, to killing pain by means of infinitesimal economic injections or psychological conditioning, on the one hand, or to acupuncture, on the other, diverting public attention to those sectors of the diseased organism that are least of all related to the cause of the disease. Why? In order to avoid a radical operation.

It may appear at first glance that the alienation of labour afflicts none but the working people, and that the exploiters who appropriate the product enrich themselves and gain the opportunity to improve themselves as individuals. But there is a dialectic here whereby the foundation of the prosperity of the propertied classes, i.e., the alienated labour, operates as a force that also cripples and dehumanises them.

While the proletarian who loathes working for the exploiter does, all the same, realise his human nature in the process of manufacturing useful things, the bourgeois is in most cases nothing more than the consumer of the labour of others. In the strict sense, this is not a human but an animal activity, though it has arisen on the basis of social production and has gained a definite social form. Clearly, it is also man's "loss of his self". "From the beginning," Marx wrote, "the worker has stood higher than the capitalist inasmuch as the latter has his roots, and finds his absolute satisfaction, in this process of alienation, while the worker rebels against it from the outset as its victim and perceives it as a process of enslavement."¹

Insofar as the capitalist had to perform the function of overseer and manager of the production process, his activity gained a certain amount of content. But the process of labour as such was exclusively a means of increasing value. Here is what Marx wrote on this score: "The self-valorisation of capital—production of surplus value—is therefore the determining, dominant and over-

¹ *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol. II (VII), Moscow, 1933, p. 34 (Russ. ed.).

riding purpose of the capitalist, the absolute urge [Trieb] and content of his activity; in fact it is merely the rationalised urge and purpose of the treasure-hoarder, an entirely wretched and abstract content which places the capitalist in the slavish conditions of the capitalist relationship in quite the same way as the worker, though on the opposite pole."¹ The capitalist, too, is not free to manifest the human creative potentialities.

It does not follow from these incontestable propositions, however, that all classes are equally interested in ending alienation. Though this is claimed, and assiduously, by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and right-wing opportunism, they do so only with the object of robbing the workers of their class purpose and disorganising the political struggle of the mass of the working people. Far from experiencing any need for liberation, the class of exploiters is resisting it by all the means at its disposal. Hence, the only force that can carry out the socialist revolution and destroy the basis for the alienation of labour and all other varieties of social alienation, is the revolutionary proletariat.

In the mid-1840s Marx and Engels, "waging a vigorous struggle against the various doctrines of petty-bourgeois socialism, ... worked out the theory and tactics of revolutionary *proletarian socialism*, or communism (Marxism)".² In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, published in February 1848, they outlined "with the clarity and brilliance of genius ... a new world-conception, consistent materialism, which also embraces the realm of social life; dialectics, as the most comprehensive and profound doctrine of development; the theory of the class struggle and of the world-historic revolutionary role of the proletariat—the creator of a new, communist society".³ Ever since then the question of the historical mission of the working class has been at the centre of social science and political practice. And its relevance does not diminish.

¹ *Ibid.*

² V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, 1980, pp. 47-48.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

The proletariat is a special class that has no equals in history. It has *two* essential features that determine all the others.

To begin with, the proletariat is *propertyless*, that is, lacking means of production and continuously needing means of subsistence. Naturally, therefore, by its objective condition—provided it is conscious of its state—it cannot fail to be opposed to exploitative private property and to any social system that reposes upon it. Conversely, it cannot fail to be interested in a radical change of its social and material condition. Referring to the workers, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* says, “They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.”¹

This explains why class-conscious workers categorically reject all the traditions of the private-property society that lack universal content, that are not common to all humankind. This explains their determination, consistency, and uncompromising radicalism in the fight against any and all forms of inequality, oppression, exploitation, indigence and spiritual poverty. This, indeed, is put down in the forceful concluding passage of the *Communist Manifesto*, that first programme document of creative Marxism: “Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.”²

Certainly, we would be wrong to say that the afore-mentioned qualities are the exclusive traits of the proletariat. Propertyless and denied even the right to dispose of their own persons were the *slaves*. In a similar situation—though with a modicum of economic independence—were the *peasant serfs*. But why did their rebellions, which sometimes made thrones tremble and which brought about the downfall of enormous empires, never have any clearly expressed positive, much less any scientific, programme? Why did they never lead to the emergence of a new system? Why did even the greatest of peasant movements profess views that

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 495.

² *Ibid.*, p. 519.

were borrowed from other classes (in Russia, for example, the so-called peasant tsarism) or a religion adapted to the needs of the moment or, at best, utopian socialism?

Essentially, for two reasons. First, the bulk of the working people in societies that preceded capitalism did not conceive social slavery as a *necessary attribute* of the social system in question. Social slavery was usually conceived as a derivative of the *personal* qualities of the slaveowner or feudal lord. Not until the pillars of the patriarchal economy were undermined and the labourer became divorced from a definite place and a definite exploiter, not until there was a certain socialisation and hence *denuded* exploitation (produced by capitalism), did the conditions appear for the proletariat to understand private-property relations as a *system* that is hostile to it, for truly enduring unity, for a consolidation of proletarians as the propertyless.

Second, it is not enough to be propertyless. Lenin put it thus: "Marx frequently quoted a very significant saying of Sismondi. The proletarians of the ancient world, this saying runs, lived at the expense of society; modern society lives at the expense of the proletarians.

"The non-propertyed, but non-working, class is incapable of overthrowing the exploiters. Only the proletarian class, which maintains the whole of society, can bring about the social revolution."¹ Such propertyless or needy working people as the slaves or petty producers possess a colossal revolutionary potential, but are unable to *remake* the system of antagonistic classes. And not at all due to the ignorance of slaves or the hold that their meagre private property has on petty proprietors—though these factors should not be written off either—but because *neither the slaves nor the petty proprietors can in principle initiate the building of a new society since they do not represent the corresponding type of organisation of labour.*

The working class is deprived of the means of production. It suffers from the insecurity of its existence. This explains a lot,

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, 1978, p. 77.

but can hardly explain the main thing: that it is the first of the exploited classes of toilers which the fundamentally new character of its productive activity in capitalist conditions has cast as the *subject (creator) of the progressive social relations*. It is a collectivist class, a force that by reason of its very place in modern machine-powered production organises itself and organises others. That is its second essential feature.

The pre-capitalist modes of production, for all the differences between them, reposed on routine techniques, on relatively ineffective implements of individual use, which restricted the scope for development and for the use of the natural and technical sciences. Irrespective of the type of property (communal or private) and the organisational form of labour (joint or individual), labourers were *technologically* divided. And when private property asserted itself as the dominant economic relationship, *the technological dissociation of labourers was compounded with their social dissociation*. The economic conditions of production gave rise to, and consolidated, alienation in relations between people.

Capitalism introduced qualitative alterations in this arrangement. It emerged as a result of the high development of private-property relations, but could not avoid changing the organisation of labour. Already in a manufactory, which assembled a certain number of specialised workers under one roof, labour was organised on common lines. The technological dissociation of labourers came to a final end with the introduction of machines, with the growth of production into a system of interacting mechanisms in which man was little more than a depersonalised element. The means and objects of labour which brought dozens, hundreds, even thousands of workers into the same premises in pursuance of a single process of production became *socialised* organisationally and technologically. A contradiction began to develop between the social character of production and the private form of appropriating the means and the results of production.

The production process, which robs the worker of the best part of his time, his energy, aptitudes and soul, moulds him as a link or element in the labour power of the collective. He func-

tions in common with other workers as a singular element of the general technological process, as a fortuitously individual manifestation of its *necessity*. The worker's labour psychology is shaped under the continuous and immediate influence of the more and more rationally organised and constantly growing production (which makes the most of the latest achievements of scientific and technical thought), imparting discipline and also cultivating discipline outside the immediate sphere of labour.

This organisational side of the worker's life activity in production is rivalled by the economic side and the worker's home life. Outside the factory, at home and when satisfying his personal needs, the proletarian is left to himself. Here the predominant influence is exercised not by the unbendable organisation of large-scale machine-powered production but by the corrupting anarchy of *private-property relations*, by the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois environment. The inexorable logic of bourgeois social relations gives people a sense of freedom exclusively at home. The worker's consciousness is split: often, he does not know whether labour may be considered a part of life, but neither is he quite sure that life amounts to eating, sleeping, and entertainment... The labour process shapes him as a collectivist, the process of appropriation as an individualist. *His proletarian nature must take the upper hand.*

The lack of perspective for the working class in the system of economic and production relations obtaining under capitalism begets a striving for change. It fires its aspiration to make a historical contribution to the ceaseless process of change and improvement of the forms of social life. Trained by modern technology for collective labour, cognisant of the essence of the age-long exploitation of man by man, conscious of its own better preparedness in contemporary society for organised struggle, the proletariat is "the intellectual and moral motive force and the physical executor"¹ of the transformations that are tied up with the process of the all-sided socialisation of labour that

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 71.

began under capitalism, and that can be brought to their culmination only by such social forms as socialism and communism.

The entire eventful history of the labour movement may be conceived as a process of the proletariat's development from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself", as the fulfilment of its world-historical mission—a process that is at once intricate and contradictory, and abounding in precipitous motion and twists that are frequently unexpected.

Both these terms—a "class in itself" and a "class for itself"—were coined by Marx and Engels. They used them, and aptly so, to denote the various stages of maturity of the working class. It was a *class in itself* before it acquired a class consciousness (or, as may also happen, had temporarily lost it for one or another reason), and led a vegetative way of life, content to fight only for partial economic improvements of its situation as a segment of exploited hired labour or to take part in the political struggle under the flag of social forces that were alien to it in class character.

As a *class for itself*, on the other hand, the proletariat is already able to clearly distinguish its own interests from those of the other classes of society, to distinguish its actual or potential allies from its actual or potential enemies, and is already sufficiently educated to understand its position as the vanguard of social progress in the current era. It has assimilated the principles of its own scientific revolutionary ideology, those of Marxism-Leninism, and has learned to apply them in practice. The necessary condition for the proletariat to become and remain a "class for itself" is, as Lenin put it, *the merging of scientific socialism with the working-class movement*, with spontaneous activity becoming a consciously organised activity as a result of the establishment of independent working-class political parties which conduct tireless and systematic ideological, political and organisational work with the mass of the people.

Once the socialist revolution is accomplished, the working class ceases to be a propertyless class, *substituting a positive economic unity* that reposes on the socialisation of the means, objects and products of labour for *the negative economic unity born of the*

insecurity of the exploited workers' existence in capitalist countries. The working class in the socialist countries is no longer a *proletariat* in the national framework, but remains a part of the world proletariat. It is not right to say, as some do, that since socialised property has replaced private property, the working class of any socialist country lacks a number of essential *all-proletarian* features. First of all, the fact that the proletariat has become the collective proprietor of the means of production does not make any single worker a private proprietor; more, private ownership is also gradually ruled out for members of other segments of society because personal labour is made the sole source of all personal incomes with the introduction of that basic principle: "he who does not work, neither shall he eat". Second, at the outset of socialist construction the working class in any socialist country *alone* inherits the large-scale capitalist organisational and technical resources, the foremost urban culture, and the aggregate of the technical and technological relations of large-scale machine-powered production, which it sets out to expand and to spread on the basis of socialised property and scientific-technical progress.

The typical mistake of the dogmatists is to under-rate the role of the working class as the *subject* of the process of the *socialisation of labour* that began, both in economic and in technological terms, under capitalism. It stems from the fallacious identification of the interests, potentialities and historical roles of the proletariat and the other classes of working people that are its allies. In the present era, the *majority* of the propertyless groups (and those related to them) have a clear stake in the *economic* socialisation that puts an end to the rule of big capital, but only the working class can socialise production *technologically* and devise new *organisational* relationships, accounting and supervision of the use of material resources, can introduce in production the principle of planning and create a *scientific* system of management for the socialised economy.

Analysing the Soviet experience of organising the proletariat as a dominant class in keeping with the ideas of the *Communist Manifesto*, Lenin singled out two fundamental points: on seizing

power, the working class maintains it, preserves it and consolidates it as every other class does, *first*, by a change of property relations and, *second*, by a new constitution.¹

It is common knowledge that historically the initial acts of the October Revolution were the transfer of all state power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, and the proposal to all the belligerent nations and governments to conclude a just and democratic peace. Those were political acts of a *superstructural* nature; this precipitated a discussion in the 1950s concerning the basis and superstructure in which one side argued that for several months—prior to the nationalisation of industry in 1918—there had been only a proletarian superstructure without the corresponding basis. The fact that the second legislative act of the Soviet Government following the Decree on Peace was the Decree on Land was explained away in the sense that its provision for the nationalisation of land was a general democratic rather than socialist act that could also have been carried out by any bourgeois state. To maintain this was tantamount to identifying the social content of measures similar in form but carried out by different classes with dissimilar and, in fact, opposite interests.

Let us recall that Lenin considered nationalisation of land not only the most radical act eliminating the survivals of feudal serfdom, but also a means of establishing the *most flexible* system for the passage to socialism in agriculture.² We gather from Margarita Fofanova's remembrances that Lenin was anxious to find at least some "meagre loophole" in the peasant mandates that would make it possible to retaylor along Bolshevik lines the socialisation introduced in them by the Socialist Revolutionaries. And he found it: the demand to hand over estates on which high-level scientific farming was practised and which were not subject to parcelling, into the exclusive use of the state or the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Speech on Economic Development, March 31, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1977, p. 474.

² See V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, 1977, p. 315.

communes. This demand made it possible to set the course on establishing a socialist sector in agriculture even before the socialisation of industry.¹

It follows that the working class had consolidated itself as the dominant class not only in the political sphere, but also in the economic, the sphere of property relations, virtually from the first day of Soviet power (for the Decree on Land was proposed to the 2nd All-Russia Congress of Soviets on the 25th and adopted on the 26th of October 1917 [Old Style]).

The proletariat does not exercise the conquered political power with the object of rising above, and enslaving, the other classes. It does so to end any and all class domination, and any and all enslavement. It does not seek to perpetuate the position it has won in society. Indeed, throughout its history, the Soviet working class has done everything to extend this position to the other strata of the associated working people in step with the maturing of the requisite material and spiritual conditions.

Today, the Soviet working class comprises two-thirds of the country's employed population. It is a gigantic human entity fused by the collectivist nature of the technology and organisation of labour in industry and by the social ownership of the means of production. It makes up the majority of the working people, a powerful segment of the working people, four out of every five of whom have secondary (ten- or eight-year) schooling or a higher education, and with two-thirds of its latest reinforcements having been trained in vocational-technical schools. The work of this category of workers in socialist production is being filled ever more with intellectual content. It is becoming typical for the modern day worker to combine functions of manual and mental labour, which is putting an end to the still obtaining prejudice (among some scholars as well) that the working class must be wholly and completely associated with operations that essentially involve muscular effort. *Neither Marx nor Engels nor Lenin*

¹ See *Istoriya Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza*, Vol. 3, Bk. I, Moscow, 1967, p. 336.

had ever admitted of so narrow an interpretation. Yes, the working class in the USSR is asserting itself as an active conductor of the scientific-technical revolution by all its being, all its achievements in furtherance of the five-year plans. And it stands beside the collective farmers and the people's intelligentsia as the bearer of the Soviet society's intellectual potential.

It may be recalled that the 26th Congress of the CPSU examined the quantitative and qualitative changes in the composition and condition of the working class as evidence of new aspects in the convergence of all the classes and social groups of Soviet society. "This is an objective but by no means a spontaneous process," the Congress noted. "Here a significant role is played by the social policy pursued by the Party and the Government. Our aim is to create a society in which people will not be divided into classes. And it may be said quite definitely that we are gradually and surely advancing towards that great objective."

Summing up the experience of our society in the past few decades, the 26th Congress of the CPSU arrived at the conclusion that *the emergence of a classless social structure will essentially, in the main, occur within the historical framework of mature socialism.* It follows that the new classless society will in its initial stage (it is still too early to say for how long) be a *socialist* rather than communist society. But its classlessness does not mean that this society will be socially structureless. Overcoming class distinctions is not the same thing as achieving complete social homogeneity. This homogeneity depends on the final elimination of the sector of manual, unskilled or semi-skilled, and hard physical labour, on the gradual elimination of socially significant distinctions between persons engaging in prevalently manual and prevalently mental, in monotonous and in creative, organisational and executive, labour. These survivals of the old division of labour will for still a long time affect the social structure in the classless socialist society. The distinctions between people in qualification or proficiency will evidently acquire a relatively greater significance, and society itself may be expected *to have an as it were cellular texture*: the influence of

various types of socialist work collectives and mass associations of citizens united and headed by Party organisations, is sure to increase. And surely the role of the latter will also increase as concentrated bearers and continuers of the world-historical mission of the working class. It would be a mistake, however, to conceive the attainment of a classless socialist society as the dissolution of just the working class or as merely its merger with the collective farmers. It will certainly be a broader process—a massive, communist-oriented transformation of *all* the social groups of working people without exception, a historical change organically related to no other but the proletarian ideals.

Illusions about the long-term perspective are counter-indicated to the working class and the labour movement. Absence of sound political realism and obviously impracticable slogans, like any put-on cheerfulness in propaganda, have a debilitating effect on its enlightenment. For even without this, the development of the working class from a “class in itself” into a “class for itself” in the setting of unabating ideological struggle is a highly ununiform process of high and low tides, of ups and downs, depending on the ability to withstand the intrigues and plots of the bourgeoisie and its ever more refined methods of manipulating the consciousness of the masses.

Our class adversaries, the 26th Congress of the CPSU pointed out, learn from their defeats. One of the lessons they drew from the failure of the “models” of counter-revolution in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 was that no one and nothing can weaken the people’s power without a substantial influence on the working class, without conditioning it in an anti-socialist spirit, and without at least partially misleading it. This largely explains the behaviour of the enemies of socialism in Poland, who took advantage of the blunders and abuses committed by the former Polish leadership to come forward hypocritically in “defence” of the workers’ interests and to pit them against their own class party, the system of proletarian dictatorship as a whole, demagogically equating the people’s democratic state as an “employer” to the capitalist employer.

How similar, isn’t it, to the pose of human rights “champion”

so assiduously adopted some time ago by the brigand American imperialism! What we saw was an attempt to bring the working class of a country that was trying to cope with the perplexing problems of the transition from capitalism to socialism in most difficult circumstances back from the state of a "class for itself" into the former, long since surmounted slavish condition of a "class in itself".

Outcroppings of crisis in Poland have not yet been entirely overcome. Only future generations of historians will be able to analyse and fathom the twists and turns of so stratified and dramatic a course of events. But it is already universally recognised that the decline in the level of a part of the Polish workers' class consciousness occurred for a number of reasons other than just the extreme neglect of ideological and political work among the masses, but also and not least of all because of the wholly unproven and utopian goal set by the former Polish leadership for the 1970s—that of building developed socialist society prior to the final settlement of the question of "who beats whom" in favour of the working people. The Polish events have again conclusively shown how important it is to apprehend in theory the various phases in the making and development of the new social system—and to apprehend them according to Marx and in no other way.

Marx's brilliant visions, the clear and concise description of the pillars of the future social arrangements contained in his works, were a priceless contribution to the proletarian philosophy of social optimism. They have stood a thorough test in the Great October Revolution and the socialist revolutions of later years, in the building of the new society in the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries.

Marx's view of the political organisation of society when the working class comes to power is of truly world-historical significance.

What transformations will the state undergo in a communist society, he asked, or what public functions analogous to the present functions of the state will survive?

The answer Marx gave, which, as he saw it, had to be scientific and only scientific, was put in the spirit of his own formula: freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into an organ wholly subordinate to society. "Between capitalist and communist society," he wrote, "lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*."¹

The practice of socialist construction has, indeed, shown that the dictatorship of the working class secures a radical replacement of the exploitative machinery of state with new bodies of power that are wholly dedicated to the interests of the working people. And none other than the proletarian dictatorship can—as various segments of society move over to socialist positions and society acquires social, political and ideological unity—set the scene for the transformation of the proletarian state and democracy into a state and democracy of the whole people.

Determining the need for a period of transition from the old society to the new and defining the class nature of the state during that period was by itself an outstanding scientific achievement. But Marx went further still. He produced a much more far-sighted social prognosis. As Lenin put it, Marx applied the theory of development to the future society because it *has its origin* in capitalism, because it is the result of the action of a social force to which capitalism *gave birth*. "There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in idle guess-work about what cannot be known," Lenin wrote. "Marx treated the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of, say, a new biological variety, once he knew that it had originated in such and such a way and was changing in such and such a definite direction."²

¹ K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 26.

² V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1980, p. 463.

Marx's scientific insight into the essence of the social system that was replacing capitalism, a system that for the first time provided every man with a tangible opportunity for rising from an isolated "private person" to a member of society with full rights, enabled Marx to infallibly anticipate some of its universally relevant features many decades ahead. Here are a few of them:

- conversion of the means of labour into the property of society as a whole;

- direct inclusion of individual labour in the aggregate collective labour, and its immediate recognition by society;

- collective appropriation of the aggregate social product;

- constant retention by society of that part of the obtained product which is not subject to individual distribution and is needed to replace worn or used up means of production or to expand production, and also to build up a reserve or insurance fund;

- deduction from the part of the product intended for consumer needs of the costs of management, of social funds for the joint satisfaction of needs (education, health, housing, community services, and the like), for the maintenance of disabled people, and so on; after Marx practice also showed the need for certain funds to be set aside for defending socialism from imperialist aggressions and attempts at exporting counter-revolution;

- distribution according to labour, depending on its quantity and quality;

- the retention in individual distribution of the principle that obtains in the exchange of commodity equivalents: a definite amount of labour in one form is exchanged for an equal amount of labour in another;

- the survival of a certain inequality in material prosperity owing to the unequal endowments of individuals, their unequal qualifications, unequal productivity of labour, and the like. In the socialist environment this "unequal right for unequal labour" plays a positive role, because so far society possesses relatively limited productive forces and consumer resources, and is com-

pelled to mould a new attitude to labour and to public property, resorting to various moral as well as material incentives.

Delving into the conditions when this right will no longer be necessary, Marx demonstrates the need for a first and a second phase of the communist formation, and offers a deep-going description of communism. "In a higher phase of communist society," he writes, "after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and with it also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a livelihood but life's prime want, after the productive forces have increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois law be left behind in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"¹

This classic reasoning of the great teacher of the proletariat lies at the root of the definition of communism in the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The social realities of the 20th century show quite conclusively that Marx is right.

Lenin subjected bourgeois ploys of "refuting" Marxism, which consisted in confusing the political and economic essence of the case by means of a mass of particulars and trumped-up "specifications", to annihilating criticism. The newly fledged vulgarisers and eclectics follow the same tack, straining to prove that Marx's vision of the future "is not coming true" because his point of departure—large-scale machine-powered industry—is at present in a phase of development that differs from that of the latter half of the 19th century. It will not be amiss to remember, however, that the evolution of industry from the factory production of Marx's time to massive flow-line production and then also partly to the automated stage, like the current scientific and technical revolution, were in one way or another predicted in the works of the founders of scientific communism. It is incompe-

¹ K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 19.

tence or prejudice that causes anyone to say that these processes are a "counterweight" to the economic law of motion of modern day society—to the ever swifter and ever more diverse progress of the socialisation of labour which Lenin, in the wake of Marx, described as the principal material foundation for the inevitable advent of socialism.¹

Sometimes, the attacks on Marx's anticipation of the substantive features of the new society were backed by the argument that Marx allegedly envisioned socialism with but one, national (state) form of public property and that he had overlooked the possible emergence of its other form, that of cooperative, group property. But that is untrue. In his famous *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, for example, Marx spoke out favourably about his contemporary workers' cooperative societies which, as he put it, were evidence of the working people's striving to revolutionise the capitalist conditions of production. In January 1886, Engels wrote to Bebel: "Marx and I have never doubted that we will have to use cooperative production as an intermediate stage on an extensive scale during the passage to fully communist economy. But matters must be so arranged that society, hence initially the state, should retain ownership of the means of production so that the special interests of the cooperative cannot supersede those of society as a whole."²

Attempts were also made to revise Marx's conception of socialism by referring to his well-known pronouncement that law in the new society will recognise no class differences because everyone will be only a worker like everyone else.³ What Marx said was alleged to be incompatible with the existence of two classes in the existing socialist societies—the working class and the cooperated farmers, and also the social stratum of the intelligentsia. But this is a case not of any "vulnerability" of the Marxian position: the new system, like any other, may be examined in its

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 71.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 36, 1967, Berlin, S. 426.

³ See K. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 18.

more developed and its less developed state. Indeed, this is exactly what right and "left" revisionists exploit in many of their speculations.

Often, Marx examined socialism that had attained "completed forms", the "consummated socialism" (Lenin), and was perfectly justified to do so. His approach was entirely different, however, when he examined some individual problems related to the making of the new society, and this in many of his works. This difference, indeed, was what Lenin had in mind when he warned of the danger of "getting lost" in particular zigzags and twists of history at the outset of the socialist road. It is important, Lenin wrote, "to retain the general perspective, to be able to see the scarlet thread that joins up the entire development of capitalism and the entire road to socialism, the road we naturally imagine as straight, and which we must imagine as straight in order to see the beginning, the continuation and the end—in real life it will never be straight, it will be incredibly involved".¹ And in performing the task of such a straight, long-term orientation of the Communist Party, the working class, the mass of the people, in the light of the basic laws of historical development, of the common principles of socialist and communist construction, Marx's theoretical outline of socialism in, say, *Capital* and the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* has always played, and will continue to play, an indispensable and exclusive role.

The bourgeois critics of scientific communism resort to slanted comparisons of the theoretical principles of Marx with the existing socialism. They go out of their way to contrast Marx's vision with the theory and practice of Leninism. Anticommunist François Fejtő, for example, maintained in his book, *L'héritage de Lénine. Introduction à l'histoire du communisme mondial*, that the Bolsheviks had, of all things, departed from "the original Marxist model of development..." Close to this were other strange "studies" that were designed to "prove" that after the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Report on the Review of the Programme and on Changing the Name of the Party, March 8, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 130.

October Revolution Lenin had created a "model" of socialism different from that of Marx. But whatever the authors of these fallacies may have referred to in arguing their case, the facts and practice have invariably refuted their contentions.

Referring to the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, which contains the fullest exposition of Marx's conception of socialism, Lenin commented in his book *The State and Revolution* that its polemical part had initially, so to speak, overshadowed its positive content. Today, however, the socialist reality brings this content out in bold relief. *Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Programme" is amazingly up-to-date in the main point: the correspondence of its judgements with the emerging contours of the society that is making the gradual transition to communism, and this more and more distinctly with the passage of time.* To begin with, the production relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance are being given ever more consummate forms in our country at an accelerated rate. This is seen in the continuing concentration of socialist industry, the establishment of production associations and mixed research-and-production associations, in the progressive inter-farm cooperation and in the agro-industrial integration. Not only current organisational economic problems are being solved, but also the more fundamental problem of the further convergence of state property and the property of kolkhozes and other cooperatives. In other words, the country is approaching that very degree of economic socialisation of the means of production that Marx had written about.

No less characteristic a feature is the emergence of a new, qualitatively higher unity round the Communist Party of socialist society in which the working class plays the leading role, and the formation of the Soviet people as a new historical community. These are developments legitimately associated with the successful obliteration of the essential distinctions between town and country, and between manual and mental labour. Common traits of behaviour, character and outlook unrelated to social or national distinctions have come to the fore among Soviet people; the worker-peasant alliance, which has at all times been the

foundation of the socialist system, has developed into a close-knit ideological and political unity of these two classes and the intelligentsia (which has long since, and firmly, assumed the socialist standpoint). The enduring alliance of all the working people, of workers by hand and by brain, the alliance between the working class, the collective farmers and the people's intelligentsia, has become a tangible fact.

The Communists of the world have had the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, that charter of scientific communism which it will be no exaggeration to say outlines practically all the essential objectives of our movement, at their disposal for now more than a century. And to this day it leaves nobody indifferent. Some see it as a magnificent social-economic project of the future human community that is being carried into effect by the efforts of many nations, invoking scientific principles to create the optimum conditions for the development of the free personality. Others see it as a reflection of the alternative that menaces their philistine bliss, their private property and exploitative order, and are spurred to selfish activity to impress upon the greatest possible number a false opinion of Marx's legacy as of a literary relic inextricably imbedded in the past. The ideological struggle between classes over Marx's ideas is today, indeed, still more bitter than when they were first made public.

We hear it said sometimes that Marx and Engels had pictured communism as a system that would be "identically" organised in both its phases. But that is a figment of the imagination. How can anyone identify the pattern of production that allows for cooperatives alongside state enterprises and a pattern based exclusively on means of production owned by the whole people; an economic pattern that reposes on distribution according to work done and thereby necessitates control over the measure of labour and measure of consumption, and an economic pattern in which distribution is according to needs and which can dispense with such control; a pattern that is a state pattern (under socialism) and a pattern that is stateless, that is self-managing (provided the outside threat of capitalist restoration no longer exists), as it should be under communism?

The passage from the first pattern to the second presupposes, among other material and production factors, a manifold increase in the intellectual and creative content of the labour of the basic work force. Furthermore, it is impossible to achieve until (in step with the growth of large-scale industry) "the creation of actual wealth becomes less dependent on the working time and the quantity of labour applied than on the power of the agents that are set in motion during the working time and which, that is, their powerful effectiveness, is in no way related to the immediate working time spent on its production, and is much rather dependent on the general state of science and on technological progress or the application of this science to production".¹

The myth of any identical organisation of socialism and communism collapses completely when viewed in the context of social equality. As we know, socialism is an as yet imperfect communist society which, as Lenin said, "is *compelled* to abolish at first *only* the 'injustice' of the means of production seized by individuals, and which is *unable* at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of consumer goods 'according to the amount of labour performed' (and not according to needs)".²

"And so," Lenin amplified, "in the first phase of communist society (usually called socialism) 'bourgeois law' is *not* abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained, i.e., only in respect of the means of production."³ Certainly, this "proportion" is not constant. The consolidation of socialism and the emergence of communist social relations tend, inevitably, to widen its scope more and more. The historically qualitative leap prepared by all the preceding development will finally lead to the abolition of the above-named legal regulators also in respect of consumer

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, S. 592.

² V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 471.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 472.

goods. This is but a different expression of the transition to communism which, if only for this one alteration, must be organised quite differently from socialism.

Whichever of the qualitative features distinguishing socialism from communism we might take, it is also related to the qualities of the people concerned, that is, to the ideological, cultural, and ethical standards of the masses which, precisely as *mass standards*, operate as an objective factor of our development. How much a person is focused on communist progress determines the effective operation of the material premises for communism that he creates. The moulding of the new man in command of the scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook and of skills in social management, a man with a high degree of general and professional culture who has a strongly developed need for creative labour and who uses the boons of socialism and communism sensibly, is certainly a long-term task. The various generations of the builders of the new society tackle it in their own way, but there is one requirement of our time that is valid for all, originating from Marx's third thesis on Feuerbach: *the individual has ever fewer grounds to consider himself a passive product of circumstances, and his development can be rationally understood only as revolutionary practice—as the coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity.*

Socialism as the first phase of communism is, according to Marx and Engels, the beginning of a truly collective life of the peoples as distinct from the "surrogates of collectivism", the illusory community which people were content with in the setting of the system of private property. The objective reasons for this are:

- the technology and organisation of modern machine-powered production, which predetermines the need for the joint, uninterrupted and tensely rhythmic labour of large masses of people;

- collective, social appropriation of the means, objects and products of labour, registration of each worker's share in the sum of the material and spiritual goods in direct proportion to the quantity and quality of his or her work;

—the practice of the principles of the socialist mode of life, first of all by the working class, the committed mass bearer of collectivist principles, of the labour ethic and the spirit of co-operation.

To be sure, socialist society has not yet completely rid itself of individualist, philistine survivals. At times, they make themselves felt fairly strongly. But this does not alter the substance of socialism as a truly collectivist system which entrenches this, its essential property, in the entire system of social relations and institutions, the type of culture, and the norms of morality and law.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union concentrates its attention on the economic principles of socialism, which are primary and basic. But it does not confine itself to them alone. As Marx showed, any developed social system cannot be judged with any degree of accuracy by any single factor, no matter how important it may be. It cannot be so judged precisely because it is a system. Other aspects of its maturity apart from the economic must be considered. But no disorderly portrayal of them (from the point of view of materialist determinism) should be tolerated, nor any concessions to personal tastes and to subjectivism in identifying or characterising them.

These days, Soviet social scientists are opting for the fruitful way Marx pointed out in reference to the formation of any new social system (though this way calls for considerable supplementary search). "If in fully developed bourgeois society," Marx wrote, "each economic relationship presupposes the other in a bourgeois-economic form, and so everything posited is thus also a premise, that is the case with every organic system. This organic system itself has its premises as a totality, and its development into a totality consists precisely in subordinating all elements of society to itself, or in creating out of society the organs it still lacks. This is historically how it becomes a totality. Its becoming this totality constitutes a moment of its process, of its development."¹

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, S. 189.

The socialist social system, which is developing into a totality that has for its core a socialised economy, is increasingly displaying the legitimate mutual correspondence between its parts and elements, spreading gradually to a wide range of production relations (technical and technological, organisational and administrative, and economic) and in general to the entire body of social relations: in production, social and political, ethical and legal, material, and ideological. *Precisely this stage of the transformation of our system into a totality is, indeed, the stage of developed socialism.* In this stage all elements of society's mode of life readjust themselves on society's collectivist principles all the more consistently and fully, the more consistently and fully the principles of socialism are carried into effect in all the areas of social life.

The process of the development of socialism into a totality makes it incumbent on us to approach any theoretical or practical task comprehensively, taking account of all the in the least relevant conditions; to see to it that economic planning is compounded with social planning; to anticipate the educational, moral and political consequences of the administrative decisions, and to lay ever greater emphasis on the human factor in all fields of production and culture.

As socialism develops it reveals and continuously augments its advantages over the system of private property. It is natural, even necessary, for the peoples of the socialist countries to strive and surpass capitalism in all basic economic and cultural indicators. That they are successful is borne out by the high and stable rates of long-term economic growth; stable employment; the plan-secured steadily rising living standard; the free access of the masses to cultural values; the guaranteed rights and freedoms of the individual, most fully reflected in the new Constitution of the USSR. Even despite its so far relatively lower production potential, the socialist system is able to provide the working people with more benefits than capitalism in terms of material and spiritual goods, social opportunities, and prospects. Yet the drive for greater abundance and higher quality of consumer goods must not obscure the main thing—the content of

the socialist way of life, its social-psychological climate, the overall picture of the conditions of work and life, man's inner world and relations with other people, because the pertinent conditions under capitalism give birth to depressive, pessimistic tendencies, whereas in the socialist environment they inspire social optimism.

Take the one fact that exploitation of man by man has been abolished in the socialist countries. Its tremendously beneficial effect on the creative and moral make-up of people is beyond any question. The citizen of the new world has no idea of the continuously depressed and warped state of mind caused by economic, political or national discrimination and oppression, those inescapable components of the daily existence of the masses in an exploitative society.

No one can deny that the price which the relatively well off sections of the working people in the industrially highly developed capitalist countries are compelled to pay for their prosperity can only partly be expressed in cash terms; to this should be added the *social stress and the chronic social-cultural underconsumption*, neither of which is measurable. In this wide-ranging comparison, the only right one, of the two systems, socialism demonstrates (and ever more convincingly as time goes on) its incontestable advantages.

In the most abstract of terms, any human community—whether society as a whole, a generation, a nation, or class—possesses *productive* capacity, that is, a definite aggregate of means and objects of labour, skills and know-how, generators of energy, and the like, on the one hand, and a historically conditioned *consumer* capacity, on the other. The most characteristic feature of an exploitative society of antagonistic classes is to oppose these capacities to each other, to impose the productive duties essentially on the propertyless, and to grant the opportunities for enjoying the boons of consumption mainly to the owners of the means of production. This, in effect, establishes a measure of needs which offers the oppressed class such norms and forms of consumption as are determined by the interests of the exploiters—at first primitively ascetic, then those programed by the ever-

present advertising—while the dominant class is given unrestricted scope for luxury and ever more sophisticated refinements.

Socialism as a social system of the working people abolishes this contradiction, for it abolishes exploitation in general. But this does not mean that the problem of needs is no longer relevant. On the contrary, there is now an opportunity for everyone to satisfy his or her needs within the bounds of society's production potential and the personal constructive contribution to the common labour of the association. Now this contribution is the sole determining element of any person's prosperity and worth and dignity. And here again we see at work the Marxian principle of the totality of the organic social system, because all social developments and processes must, in the final analysis, be tied up and agreed between themselves.

The *law of increasing requirements* discovered by Lenin,¹ gains full scope in the new society. According to this law, the spectrum of spiritual, social, cultural, and creative requirements widens in step with the satisfaction of the reasonable and necessary "needs of subsistence". Furthermore, in the final analysis, the operation of this law makes meaningful and socially useful labour the prime need of the individual. And this means that for the new man labour acquires the social property of a *consumer value*. This confirms one of Marx's most important discoveries.

Copying the consumerist scheme typical of capitalist society, borrowing bourgeois consumerist standards which deform the moral make-up of the individual living under socialism and leading an unsocialist way of life, is, of course, totally unacceptable in our environment. The 26th Congress of the CPSU said on this score: "We have large material and intellectual potentialities for the ever fuller development of the individual, and we shall continue to increase these potentialities. However, it is important that each person should be able to utilise them intelligently. In the long run this depends on the interests and needs of the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "On the So-Called Market Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 106.

individual. For that reason our Party sees the active, meaningful shaping of these interests and needs as a major aim of its social policy."

Socialism's historical challenge in the fight for the individual, our class adversaries are trying to break down into the small change of narrow consumer interests and "values". Naturally, socialist society devotes ever greater attention to satisfying the continuously growing material needs of Soviet people. But it conceives the competition between the two systems on a far broader and larger scale.

It will not be amiss here to recall the words of that splendid Soviet educator, A. S. Makarenko, who held that the most important thing we are accustomed to admire in man—strength and beauty—depends entirely on the type of his relationship to the perspective. For example, we may be concerned with satisfying the simplest, immediate requirement—a meal, going to the cinema, buying something new. That, too, is a perspective, but a most immediate one, and anyone who suits his behaviour to none but this perspective, looks the weakest of the lot. "If he is satisfied solely by his own, albeit distant, perspective, he may look strong but will not elicit in us any feeling of personal beauty or true value," Makarenko wrote. "The broader the collective whose perspectives the person conceives as his own, the more beautiful and more lofty that person is."¹

One of the most vivid achievements of the new society is the sense typical of Soviet people of an indissoluble link between the personal perspectives and the perspectives of the Motherland, of the socialist community, of the national and social emancipation of the peoples, of the progress of all humanity. That, indeed, is the motivated position in life that elevates the personality and that the 25th Congress of the CPSU defined as the objective of ethical education. This position can be stable only if it is based on the scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook, on internationalist convictions, whose roots are nourished by our socialist life.

¹ A. S. Makarenko, *Pedagogical Works*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p. 179 (in Russian).

"To bring up a person is to cultivate perspective ways for him to follow,"¹ said Makarenko. This "philosopher's stone" of the optimistic perception of life was found by scientific communism and tested by the socialist system. Those who study the Marxist legacy conscientiously, acquire it quickly. Capitalist society, in which the personality is sealed up in an eggshell of individualist interests, can give the individual nothing of the sort. There, the general crisis of the system of private property expresses itself, among other things, in a loss of social and national aims, in a pathological lack of promise and perspective. There, a person who does not belong to the class of exploiters is constantly hounded by insecurity, no matter how much he may have achieved in life.

The collective whose immediate and distant perspectives were for Marx personal perspectives is called *humanity*. But he did not treat this collective as an abstraction, with the all-encompassing and all-forgiving show of love which is sometimes passed off as humanism. *As a man of the Party*, Marx distinguished in humanity its foremost part, that precious concentration of humanness which is alone able to deliver the human race from social and national enslavement, namely, the embattled revolutionary proletariat. Unless this fact is understood, it will not be possible to understand why Marx described communism as humanism in action.

Marx, and with him Engels and Lenin (for we must study all three together), is for us the chief instructor in the perspective ways. He had his feet firmly planted on the soil of his time, but all his being was turned towards the future. He dreamed of it, he lived for it, he fought for it. "I congratulate you. . .," he wrote on 29 April, 1881, to his daughter Jenny on the birth of his grandson. "My 'women' had hoped that the 'new citizen' would augment the 'better half' of the population; for my part, however, I prefer the 'male' sex for children who are being born at this turning point in history. The most revolutionary period that people have ever gone through lies before them. These days,

¹ *Ibid.*

it is bad to be so 'old' as to only anticipate rather than see for oneself."¹

Marx knew that he would not live to see the beginning of the new, communist, social-economic formation whose advent he predicted. His life ended a few decades earlier. But his vision was accurate. It was just as authentic and scientific as any accomplished fact. What is more, it continues to work tirelessly and successfully for the benefit of his followers and of the revolution.

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 35, Berlin, 1967, S. 186.

VADIM ZAGLADIN

**First Deputy Chief,
International Affairs Section,
CPSU Central Committee
Dr. Sc. (Phil.)**

STANISLAV MENSHIKOV

Dr. Sc. (Econ.)

IVAN FROLOV

**Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences**

**KARL MARX AND
THE EMANCIPATION OF MAN AS
A WORLD HISTORICAL PROCESS**

Among Karl Marx's lifelong favourite images of poetry and social ideals was Prometheus, champion and liberator of man. This mythical titan installed hope in men and gave them divine fire—the light of reason and knowledge.

Actually Marx himself was a Promethean titan—a mental giant and a champion of revolutionary action for the emancipation of man.

We the adherents and followers of Marx's doctrine and cause take immeasurable pride in the awareness that he, a brilliant thinker and true humanitarian, stands at the source of our philosophy and the lofty cause of man's emancipation. "His name will endure through the ages, and so also will his work!" was the prophetic conclusion of the speech Frederick Engels made at the grave of his great friend 100 years ago.

This prophesy has come true: made fruitful by the genius of Lenin and the experience of the Communist Party he creat-

ed, the *cause of Marx*—his doctrine and revolutionary activity—has found its tangible expression in the historic movement of socialism and communism. It has become a reality for the countries of the socialist community, the ideological banner of the world communist and working-class movement in its fight to free man from the shackles of exploiter socio-economic relations. The *name of Marx*, together with the name of Lenin who carried Marx's doctrine forward to a new high, has been recorded for ever in *Marxism-Leninism*, an integral science dealing with the ways and methods of man's emancipation and representing the *collective intellect* of the world communist movement.

Marx, Engels and Lenin have proved that the world historical process of man's emancipation means above all revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the communist formation, with socialism as the stage at which it emerges and develops. However, socio-economic emancipation of man from the fetters of exploiter capitalist relations is only the beginning of the complex *shaping* of the new man, which completes his emancipation as a "*species being*". This precept, constantly stressed by Marx, has been developed creatively in Lenin's works and in the activities of the CPSU and other fraternal parties of socialist, capitalist and developing countries.

That is why today the world historical process of man's emancipation is seen as comprising several elements—the struggle to solve the fundamental, global problems of the contemporary world, first and foremost, problems of peace and disarmament; the struggle for far-reaching socio-economic and political transformations in capitalist countries, for overcoming the economic crisis, against the exploitation of the working class and all working people, for democracy and socialism; the struggle to attain genuine national independence and overcome the legacy of colonial rule in the now free countries; and, finally, the positive efforts of the countries of established socialism in tackling urgent economic and social problems, raising living standards and people's intellectual level and ensuring all-round

harmonious development of the human personality. Viewed against the background of this complex set of problems raised and dealt with by Marx, Engels, Lenin, the CPSU and the world communist and working-class movement, the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of man's emancipation and Marxism-Leninism as such are seen as an integral system comprising, due to its profound meaning, *scientific, revolutionary and humanitarian aspects* as organic and inseparable elements. That is why today Marxism-Leninism is, in practical terms, the most effective and, intellectually, the most attractive doctrine for all those who are on the side of progress, who are actually sensitive to the problems and contradictions of today's world.

Understanding the processes which comprise the general crisis of capitalism is the starting point in an analysis of the current situation in capitalist countries and of the ways of man's revolutionary emancipation from the fetters of exploitation. There are two social systems in the world of today; one of them, capitalism, is in a state of comprehensive crisis which embraces all spheres—politics and ideology, way of life and culture. To a Marxist, it is a truism that the deepest roots and initial manifestations of this crisis lie in economics, in the economic basis of society. "The peak in the development of this *basis* itself..." Marx wrote, "is the point where the basis assumes a form in which it is compatible with *the highest development of the productive forces* and, consequently, also with the richest possible development of individuals [in terms of the given basis]. As soon as this point is reached, further development turns into a decline, and new development begins on a new basis."¹

The fact that periodic economic crises are becoming increasingly acute testifies to the decline of contemporary capitalism. The two latest cyclic recessions in production—from 1973 to 1975 and from 1979 to 1983—have clearly been the gravest and longest over the past four decades. The recurrent fever

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Moscow, 1939, S. 439.

which began as far back as the early 1800s is shaking capitalism again now, in the last quarter of the 20th century, and with greater force.

The disease is made all the more grave by its link to what is now known as structural crises. This term refers to overproduction crises affecting individual industries and lasting for ten years and more (in the steel, textile and automobile industries and in shipbuilding), crises stemming, to varying degrees, from underproduction in industries producing vital commodities (energy, raw materials and food), chronic ailments in the sphere of circulation (inflation and crises affecting interest rates, finances and monetary systems), are well as long-term trends toward stunted production growth and stunted labour productivity.

In *Theories of Surplus-Value* Marx identifies and even classifies various forms of crises. He speaks about crises arising from "*disturbances in the first phase of reproduction*: that is to say, interrupted conversion of commodities into money or *interruption of sale*". This applies to cyclic and protracted overproduction crises in individual industries. Then Marx singles out crises which result from "the rise in the price of raw materials", from "interruptions in the *flowing back* of the elements of productive capital". This applies to the energy and commodity crises. Finally, Marx points to crises rooted in the "increased price of the *necessary means of subsistence*"¹—today's inflation and food crisis.

Crises of the second and third type were not typical of the time Marx described. But he proved capable of foreseeing them theoretically. They have become typical of the current stage in the general crisis of capitalism. Their combination with cyclic crises has also become typical, with each developed capitalist country offering its own distinctive form of this combination—what Marxists in these countries describe as national structural

¹ K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part II, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 517.

economic crises of US, French, British or Japanese capitalism. These are specific cases and forms of the general crisis of capitalism.

Obviously, this overall crisis situation is not the result of sudden isolated shocks, as bourgeois theorists claim referring, among other things, to the abrupt hike in oil prices. After all, oil itself has now reached a stage of overproduction. Oil prices are decreasing, but the crisis continues, and the drop in prices is generating as much panic among capitalists as the rise did previously. It follows that the cause lies elsewhere.

The deterioration of the economic situation over the past decade is also explained by the so-called long cycles lasting 45 to 50 years. Theoretically, one cannot rule out that such crises do occur. It is a fact that during some periods factors which prevent the tendency of the average rate of profit to fall move to the foreground (higher rate of exploitation, relative reduction in the cost of constant capital elements, slower and even zero growth in the organic composition of capital). These are superseded by other, also lengthy periods when average profits fall despite all efforts to the contrary, considerably impeding capitalist reproduction. This recurring sequence is due largely to the uneven nature of technological progress under capitalism, to its spurts and slumps. The current period is one of slower technological progress and a long-term drop in the average rate of profit. Still, this can hardly explain away all the difficulties of the modern capitalist economy.

Let us return to what Marx says about the *basis*. The economic basis changes and adapts under capitalism too. At the turn of the century, the objective need to develop the productive forces brought about the transition from free competition to monopoly capitalism. This opened greater opportunities for production growth and technological progress. Capitalism, Lenin noted, began to develop immeasurably faster than before—but not for long. By the early 1930s the narrow basis of monopoly domination clashed violently with society's need of mass production and mass consumption. The result was the "Great Depression" of the 1930s.

The capitalist system responded to this conflict with further alterations in the basis and the evolution of monopoly capital into state-monopoly capital. Capitalism countered the social anarchy of production aggravated by the monopolies with attempts at centralised regulation of social reproduction. It was the heyday of Keynesianism, a bourgeois science about ways to enlarge, with government assistance, aggregate social demand by gearing it to production capacities. What this led to is well-known: three decades of rapid production growth were followed by a new slump in the growth rate, more severe crises, the emergence of chronically acute inflation, an unprecedented rise in unemployment, continuously undercharged capacities, and malignant militarisation of the economy and science. Government regulation proved untenable and the bankruptcy of the Keynesian and other theories underlying this regulation, generally recognised. The state-monopoly basis has clearly become obsolete. What will be the next stage?

Marx discovered the law of movement within capitalism to progressively higher stages of centralisation of production and socialisation of labour.¹ Under modern capitalism, concentration of production has long transcended national frontiers. The first international monopolies appeared as early as the beginning of the century. But it is only over the past two decades that the development of international specialisation and cooperative effort in production has made transnational corporations a salient form of internationalisation of capital. In the 1970s the new stage of concentration reached maturity. Together with transnational industrial monopolies, transnational banks also grew in number; transnational finance capital and a transnational finance oligarchy emerged. Their merger with the state and with international associations served as a basis for the rise of transnational state-monopoly capitalism. Transnational military-industrial complexes appeared, and international alliances of the most reactionary political quarters became especially close-knit.

¹ See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 715.

Objectively, the evolution of state-monopoly capitalism into its transnational form expresses the striving to transcend the narrow limits of national regulation of the economy, alleviate contradictions and conflicts among national monopolies and governments on world markets, in the monetary field and in the struggle for commodity and energy sources, and to elaborate a common policy in economic relations with the socialist countries and newly independent states.

For several years now, efforts to draw up a programme of action in this direction have been undertaken by the Trilateral Commission, established at the initiative of the Rockefeller and other US finance groups and comprising representatives of US, West European and Japanese ruling quarters. Expressing their interests, Henry Kissinger, formerly US Secretary of State and now consultant with transnational enterprises, wrote recently in his article "Saving the World Economy" that "recovery will not take place if different countries in the industrialised world continue to pursue incompatible economic policies. . . . The industrial democracies (i.e., capitalist countries.—*Authors*) must achieve an unprecedented coordination of their economic policies". Mr. Kissinger could not help inserting that "America, as the strongest country, must take the lead".

Despite such appeals, the elaboration of a concerted economic policy of capitalist powers is progressing very slowly—in actual fact, marking time. The foremost reason is that the internationalisation of capital and its evolution into a cosmopolitan entity have failed to end the rivalry among national monopolies and among transnational business groups. Moreover, the intensity of interimperialist contradictions has become unprecedented in recent years. Pitched battles are being fought continuously in all major spheres of activity—in trade, monetary relations and interest rates policy. Western powers disagree on all key economic issues. Given the deep and protracted economic crisis, not one of the competing countries or groups wants to or can sacrifice its profits and risk an exacerbation of its internal social contradictions. As Lenin foresaw in his struggle against Kautsky's theory of "ultra-imperialism", even "internationally

united finance capital" is unable to eliminate "friction, conflicts and struggle in every possible form".¹

A very important motive behind this intensification of contradictions is the increasingly expansionist and aggressive designs of US imperialism which tries to use the internationalisation of capital primarily to establish its own diktat and leadership in economic and political affairs and to step up the exploitation of other countries, including developed ones. It is precisely these reactionary trends that the domestic and foreign policy of the current US Administration reflects. Reagan's blatant programme means 'unprecedented acceleration of the nuclear arms race in the United States and in allied countries, the staging of "social revenge" on socialism and national liberation on the international scene, attempts at "class revenge" on the working masses by an unheard-of offensive to reduce real incomes and allocations for social needs, and finally, moves to strangle rivals in the interimperialist competition. It, too, is a programme of transnational capital—but primarily of its more conservative, militarist and revenge-seeking interests. They see slogans of "social prosperity" and "coordination of sovereign countries' efforts" as hopelessly obsolete and deserving to be dumped once and for all.

One cannot fail to see the great danger to working people and to all mankind which springs from this trend in transnational capitalism. It brings to all nations a sharply increased threat of nuclear catastrophe. As to the working class and all working people in capitalist countries, it promises to bring down their living standards, deprive them of the social gains secured in the course of earlier class struggle and reduce them to a level which completely ignores their modern material and spiritual needs and is contrary to their role as society's principal productive force. For newly independent countries, the prospects it brings are perpetuation of backwardness and revival of openly colonialist and neocolonialist ways. It threatens even developed

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, 1977, pp. 294-95.

capitalist countries with erosion of their national sovereignty and independence.

However, by opposing most of mankind, this reckless course aggravates all the contradictions of today's world and thus dooms itself. There is and there can be no future to reactionary cosmopolitan capitalism.

The current crisis of capitalism has spread not only to what might be described as basic relations but also to *all aspects of life* under capitalism. This explains why Communists assert uncompromisingly that the crisis of the capitalist mode of production is also a *crisis of human relations in their totality*—labour, the school, the family, morals, politics, culture and the very understanding of the *meaning of life* under capitalism. This raises the more general question of the nature of contradictions inherent in today's capitalism and of their relation to the world historical process of man's emancipation.

In his concrete analysis of the system of contradictions pushing capitalist society first upward and then to its decline and demise, Marx specially singled out two such factors: the contradiction between production, objectively becoming more and more socialised (up to and including its internationalisation), and appropriation which remains private in character, and its counterpart in the social sphere—the contradiction between labour and capital: in Marx's words, between the bourgeois and the proletarians. "This contradiction," Engels noted, "*contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today.*"¹ According to Marx, the solution of this contradiction above all would mean the elimination of exploiter relations—the key prerequisite for the emancipation of man.

The "bourgeois vs. proletarians" contradiction is the main social contradiction of capitalism as a formation. It has mani-

¹ F. Engels, "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 137.

fested itself both within the national context of each country and—although in a much less pronounced form—at the international level. During the period in question, especially acute and noticeable on the international scene were intercapitalist contradictions—competition, often described by Marx as “war of everyone against everyone”.

Begun by Marx, the analysis of the capitalist contradictions was continued by Lenin who justly saw it as a necessary source of enrichment for the science of proletarian socialism. Examining imperialism—the highest and last stage of capitalist development—he stressed, on the one hand, the new and much higher degree of socialisation and internationalisation of production, and, on the other, the intensification and development on this basis of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie (both sides had been evolving and changing considerably). In the new conditions, this contradiction became international. Now, Lenin wrote, it was the question of “the antagonism between internationally united capital and the international working-class movement”.¹

At the same time Lenin showed that, stemming from and alongside the main social contradiction of the capitalist formation, a new social contradiction had emerged—between the monopolies and the people. This contradiction formed the basis for the growth of broad democratic movements, for progressive convergence of the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism.

Besides, Lenin profoundly analysed one more extremely far-reaching and explosive revolutionary contradiction generated by imperialism—between colonial powers and colonies. His conclusion was that at some stage in the future this contradiction would grow closer to and intertwine with the principal social contradiction of capitalism, that the peoples fighting against colonial domination would, in the final analysis, increasingly turn against capitalism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Right of Nations to Self-Determination”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, 1972, p. 401.

Finally, Lenin witnessed the birth of a new contradiction in world development, a new stage of the "bourgeois vs. proletarians" contradiction. It was the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. Naturally, during Lenin's lifetime this contradiction was in its initial stages. Still, even at that time Lenin foresaw the birth of the new central antagonism as the major motive force of world history in the period of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism begun by the October Revolution.

Since the formulation of these conclusions, new elements have arisen both in the overall way capitalist contradictions have developed and in the specific forms this evolution has taken.

Generally speaking, one can say that three features have been typical of the dynamics of these contradictions over the past six decades. First, they have become more diverse: new contradictions have emerged and considerably affected the entire course of world history; while some of the old contradictions have gone through a process of differentiation. Second, contradictions inherent in the way the world developed were converging, becoming intertwined and even integrated. Third, both old and new contradictions have intensified, which has accelerated social progress.

First of all, the main contradiction of our era—between socialism and capitalism—has developed substantially over the past decades. Its role as the foremost contradiction of contemporary social development is due to the fact that, on the one hand, it points out the major direction of social progress; on the other hand, because of it, its impact on the development of all the other contemporary contradictions is growing increasingly pronounced.

This contradiction has developed both *quantitatively* and *qualitatively*. In *quantitative* terms, the 1917 alignment of forces between its two sides was, on the whole, still in favour of imperialism; socialism, represented by Soviet Russia alone, was virtually a besieged fortress repulsing enemy attacks with great difficulty. The socialism of 1983 represents one third of all

mankind; in many quantitative aspects—economic, scientific, technological and military—it has caught up with imperialism, its rival. In *qualitative* terms, it is increasingly obvious that socialism is turning into the most influential factor of world history, later to become the most decisive.

This has brought about the current, extraordinary exacerbation of the contradiction between imperialism and socialism—the imperialist attempt to reverse or at least check the march of history, resorting to any means, even the most reckless and dangerous to the future of mankind—up to and including nuclear blackmail and the threat to launch nuclear war.

However, this is not surprising: the transition from capitalism to socialism is no ordinary historical step from one formation to another. It is a twofold transition: both from an inferior social system to a superior one, and an era when private property was held sway for millennia to an era of man's complete emancipation from all types of social oppression, from all oppression in general.

Of course, the development of the contradiction between socialism and capitalism not only failed to cancel out the main social contradiction of the capitalist world ("bourgeois vs. proletarians"), but, on the contrary, drove it onward. The growth of world socialism was objectively affecting both sides of the "bourgeois vs. proletarians" contradiction. On the one hand, it strengthened the position of the working class and enhanced its conviction that replacement of capitalism with socialism (in different forms and at different rates) was a feasible goal, that the proletarian struggle was historically justified and promising. On the other hand, the growth of socialism weakened the positions of capitalism in its confrontation with the working class.

The "bourgeois vs. proletarians" contradiction has been made more acute and more profound by those socio-economic changes in capitalist society which result from the scientific and technological revolution and from the already mentioned intensified socialisation of production and labour. Primarily, these changes

affected the working class which has grown numerically (in Europe, North America, Japan and the more developed Latin American countries it represents a majority of the population) and risen spiritually; its vanguard has also advanced ideologically and politically. Simultaneously, the working class has been affected by internal differentiation; its stratification has increased and the strata bordering on the bourgeoisie have become more numerous (often making it more difficult to identify the revolutionary potential of the proletariat as a class).

The changes have affected the bourgeoisie too. But here it has been a reverse process: the class has grown numerically smaller, and the stratification has led to the emergence within it, on the one hand, of a narrowing "elite" group of monopoly and international monopoly capital tycoons and, on the other, of a mass of small-scale businessmen, formally independent but actually completely under the sway of big business and hovering on the brink of ruin.

The progressing crisis, the growth of unemployment turning a large part of the working population (up to ten per cent) into outcasts without hope—all this also changes substantially the social environment of contemporary capitalism and aggravates the contradictions innate to it.

And finally, the gap between the interests and actions of the top level of monopoly capital and of the overwhelming majority of the people is growing and reaching truly unprecedented depths. Today, Marx's conclusion that capitalist production is "a historical form of social development", which "stands in contradiction to that part of the population which constitutes the basis of that whole development",¹ rings with particular force. This results in a considerable expansion of the framework for general democratic trends and movements, for the broadest possible rallying together of antimonopolist, left forces and for the continuation of the process which brings the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism still closer together.

¹ K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, 1978, p. 261.

We have already noted that in the age of imperialism the contradiction between the bourgeois and the proletarians becomes practically international. This process has now entered a new stage and manifests itself in increasingly diverse forms.

First, the working class continues to grow not only in the socialist and developed capitalist countries but also, increasingly, in the formerly colonial world. Marx noted that, in principle, the proletariat could exist only in *world historical terms*. Today the working class really exists on a world historical scale; it is socially active throughout the world. Consequently, the "bourgeois vs. proletarians" contradiction also affects the entire world in *actual fact*, both objectively and subjectively.

Second, the advancement of the international working-class movement—above all the growth of the world communist movement and the increase in the membership of the trade union federations active virtually on every continent—all this, taken as a whole, means genuine internationalisation of the working-class struggle.

Third, a new step in the actual internationalisation of the class struggle, waged by the working class, is connected with the recent emergence and development of transnational monopolies. Internationally united capital is fighting simultaneously against the working class of several countries, both developed and developing. Naturally, this generates international resistance on the part of the workers.

The internationalisation of the main social contradiction of capitalism objectively demands stronger international ties binding various contingents of working people together. This, however, does not rule out certain problems which impede the establishment of such ties. It follows that today it is especially important to take carefully into account the national interests and distinctive features of different contingents of the working class, to organise their concerted action in a way which would not violate these interests and would respect these distinctive features. In actual fact, this diversity of forms concerning the existence, struggle, interests and distinctive features of different contingents of the working class is not a factor causing its frag-

mentation (although it is sometimes used to this end) but an element ensuring greater efficiency of its joint action.

The contradiction between colonial powers and colonies has also continued to develop. In fact, it is no longer accurate to call this contradiction by its old name because most former colonies have attained independence and the classic colonial system has ceased to exist.

However, the heart of the matter remains unchanged. Imperialism continues to exploit the now independent former colonies by resorting to various methods. It still appropriates part of their surplus labour, "giving nothing in return", as Marx put it.¹ Therefore today, too, we are dealing with an acute contradiction between, on the one hand, imperialism and its policy of oppressing developing nations and exploiting their natural resources, and, on the other hand, developing countries and their peoples who are striving to attain complete liberation, including economic emancipation, and to overcome the colonial legacy of economic backwardness.

This contradiction works in many forms. Among its more noticeable expressions is developing countries' demand of a new world economic order—essentially, a demand of an end to neocolonialism, of democratic international economic relations.

It is very important that the contradiction between developing countries and imperialism is undergoing a degree of differentiation. On the one hand, as some developing countries switch to socialist orientation, this generates prerequisites for the transformation of this contradiction into that between socialism and capitalism. In other words, a distinctive process is under way—the contradiction between developing countries and imperialism and the contradiction between socialism and capitalism are moving closer together. It is this process which underlies the increasing rapprochement between socialist-oriented developing countries and the socialist community.

The other aspect is the advancement of former colonies along

¹ See K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, S. 755.

the capitalist road, leading even to the emergence of indigenous monopoly capital. Of course, the contradictions between such developing countries and imperialism remain, but they assume a new, different character. Essentially, here we are already dealing with elements of competition on the capitalist basis; this development, however, raises no doubts at all as to the anti-imperialist thrust of these countries' policies.

The complexity of the contradictions existing in the formerly colonial world calls for in-depth examination. Still, it is incontestable that here, as in developed capitalist countries, social development is accelerating and intensifying.

Special attention should be paid to a new group of contradictions in world development—a category which Marx and Lenin mentioned in general theoretical terms but which found its concrete expression only in our age—more precisely, in the 1960s and 1970s. This is a group of contradictions which can be tentatively described as contradictions between imperialism and mankind as a whole.

Take the issues commonly referred to as today's global problems. Foremost among them is the threat of nuclear war which can call into question the very survival of civilisation as a whole. Then there are the problems of overcoming economic backwardness and of eliminating hunger and poverty, especially in developing countries. And finally, there is the group of problems concerning man's relations with his environment.

Some of these global problems have been brought about by insufficient compensation of nature for the damage inflicted on it by man. However, many of them have been the result of antagonistic social relations, national oppression and wars which have reached the level of world wars. The political urgency of global problems is that without their solution not only further development but even the very survival of mankind is virtually impossible.

Imperialism is what stands in the way of their solution. To say that it aggravates the existing global problems would be an understatement; it also concentrates and raises them to catastrophic proportions, threatening civilisation itself.

In other words, now it is no longer merely internal developments in each individual capitalist country but also world development in general which testify to the vital necessity of profound social change, of revolutionary solution to the contradictions generated by capitalism. Only by revolutionary transformation mankind can truly resolve, as Marx put it, the conflict between man and man, between the individual and the species, between man and nature.¹ The forms of social change have always been and will be infinitely diverse. None of them can be canonised or turned into a fetish. Still, what is meant here is essentially far-reaching social change on the global scale.

Such change does not occur spontaneously, nor is it made to order; it is generated gradually by social development itself. Besides, social change usually occurs within a national context and not at the international level. This means that although a radical solution of the problem in question is possible only under socialism, one cannot wait for it to triumph everywhere first. One should search for a solution proceeding from the current social conditions. This is the kind of solution socialism and developing countries propose—to comprehensively develop all-round peaceful cooperation.

One can state in general terms that up to now the threat to the future of mankind has been growing exponentially. Today, the task of the states genuinely advocating the advancement of international cooperation for peace and progress, the task of peoples and their mass organisations is to work together to assure a different exponential curve—a rise of the liberation struggle, of the struggle to establish democratic international relations and to prevent war.

This platform offers an effective opportunity for the broadest possible unification of all social forces existing in today's world. After all, the struggle is virtually for the survival of mankind. On the whole, today this appears as—and really is—a generally democratic task. However, the essence of the problems to be

¹ See K. Marx, "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 296.

solved and their close connection to the necessary social progress gradually impart an increasingly social character to the global problems, to the drive for their solution and, consequently, to the contradiction between imperialism and all mankind.

In other words, the same developments are occurring within the capitalist world and on the international scene: the struggle for democracy is moving closer to the struggle for socialism. This rapprochement is extremely fruitful and promising. However, there is no doubt that, while largely spontaneous, this process nevertheless calls for an active subjective factor, for the involvement of man himself in the struggle for his emancipation. Of great importance here is the Marxist-Leninist concept of the *social essence* of man and of the ways to his emancipation as a personality in its dialectical unity with society, with economic, social and spiritual aspects of his life and work.

One of the highest accomplishments of Marx is that he theoretically discovered and substantiated the concept of man's social essence. This made it possible to put the entire world historical process of man's emancipation on a scientific basis, to highlight its main source and motive force—revolutionary transformation of the entire system of capitalist social relations leading to socialism and communism. Developing this fundamental conclusion made by Marx, Lenin devastatingly criticised the theoretical and practical political concepts maintaining that human nature was purportedly immutable and plagued by all kinds of innate flaws, including those stemming from private property. This, it was alleged, made the building of socialism a utopia, because this could be done only after some special people—"new material" for socialism—had been shaped. Lenin wrote in this connection: "We want to build socialism with the aid of those men and women who grew up under capitalism, were depraved and corrupted by capitalism, but steeled for the struggle by capitalism. . . . We want to start building socialism at once out of the material that capitalism

left us yesterday to be used today, at this very moment, and not with people reared in hothouses, assuming that we were to take this fairy-tale seriously.”¹

In the current situation these scientific Marxist-Leninist conclusions find their theoretical and practical implementation in the work of the CPSU and other fraternal parties of the socialist countries. They have become the conceptual basis of the *humanitarian strategy* of Marxists-Leninists throughout the world in their struggle for the socio-economic and spiritual emancipation and development of man.

In terms of methodology, the key to a scientific understanding of these problems is contained in Marx's famous precept that “the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations”.² One would be hard put to find a pithier formula in the history of human thought. Its historical significance is that it made it possible to definitively overcome one-sided crude anthropologism which treated the problems of man, his emancipation and development in an absolutised, “atomistic” way, accompanied by abstractly philosophical or biosocial simplification; Marx's formula organically combined these problems with a materialist view of history, with the class struggle of the proletariat, the theory of revolution and the doctrine of socialism and communism as truly human society enabling man to realise himself in social forms adequate to his essence.

Today, when the bourgeois ideology is dominated by oversimplified and invariably biased concepts of man, Marx's understanding of the problems of man emerges as the *most consistent concept, scientific and integral throughout*, which underlies the world historical process of man's emancipation and development. For, as Marx stresses, “the coincidence of the changing

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Achievements and Difficulties”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, pp. 69, 70.

² K. Marx, “Theses on Feuerbach”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 1976, p. 4.

of circumstances and of human activity ... can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionary practice*".¹

The fact that man is essentially defined as "society in a nutshell" and society as "man in his diversity" makes it possible to give a scientific answer to the age-old question about the correlation of social and biological factors, thus overcoming the many pseudobiological, neoeugenic and other ideas used in an attempt to lead social thought away from the central issue—from social activity in the name of man's emancipation and development. These ideas ignore the fact that, as proved by Marx, biological factors (which Marxism does not at all deny) operate in man in a transformed, "superseded" way, that there exists *the dialectics of the biological conditioned and transformed by the social*, since "human objects are not natural objects as they immediately present themselves".² Today this imparts extremely great significance to Marx's postulate that the *object-oriented activity* of man as a social being is the focus of the unity and interaction of the biological and social. And, since, according to Marx, society is "man himself in his social relations",³ here we deal precisely with "appropriation of human reality"⁴ in the course of which the totality of human requirements and abilities develops—the requirements and abilities taking shape through object forms, methods and means of culture—labour, language, habits, skills, knowledge, artistic expression, etc.

Therefore, the *progress of man*—his emergence and development—is, according to Marx, the acquisition and reproduction by the individual of mankind's socio-historical experience and material and spiritual culture in his intercourse with other in-

¹ *Ibid.*

² K. Marx, "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 337.

³ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, S. 600.

⁴ K. Marx, "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 300.

dividuals; it is his involvement in mankind's socio-cultural progress in the course of his training, education and development. This *historical* approach enables one not only to scientifically understand the laws of man's emergence and development but also to correctly build the strategy used to shape a personality essentially capable of meeting the new demands set by the current scientific and technological revolution and by the actual circumstances and ideals of socialism and communism. Marx's doctrine of the social essence of man is central to this sphere too because it follows from it that by examining the social relations of men we reveal the *actual* links of the individual. Lenin stressed this aptly when, raising the question, "By what criteria are we to judge the *real* 'thoughts and feelings' of *real* individuals?" he replied: "Naturally, there can be only one such criterion—the *actions* of these individuals. And since we are dealing only with social 'thoughts and feelings', one should add: the *social actions* of individuals, i.e., *social facts*."¹

The *social actions* of individuals Lenin referred to are at the same time a condition of their development which assumes adequate forms only in a society where *the development of the wealth of human nature* becomes an *end in itself*, a society capable of "the full elaboration of all his [man's] creative abilities, without any preconditions other than antecedent historical evolution which makes the totality of this development—i.e., the development of all human faculties as such, not measured by any *previously established* yardstick. . . . Man does not reproduce himself in any predetermined form, but produces his totality . . . he does not seek to remain something already formed, but is in the absolute movement of becoming".²

Such comprehensive development is not reserved for the elite. Marx stressed that "although at first the development . . .

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, 1977, p. 405.

² K. Marx, "Economic Manuscripts of 1857-59", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Pre-Capitalist Socio-Economic Formations*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 101.

takes place at the cost of the majority of human individuals and even classes, in the end it breaks through this contradiction and coincides with the development of the individual".¹ The revolutionary overthrow of capitalist exploiter relations and the transition to communism will create such social conditions in which "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all".² Correcting Plekhanov during the preparation of the first programme of our Party, Lenin, we might recall, specially stressed that the new society and its organisation were to be created for "ensuring *full* well-being and free, *all-round* development for *all* the members of society".³

Marxism-Leninism offers profound scientific substantiation of this truly humanitarian process.

Its main features could be summarised in the following interconnected propositions.

1. Economic and social emancipation of man means that the worker ceases to be an object of exploitation and an appendix of a production process; he becomes a creative agent. After the elimination of capitalist production the worker's alienation from the means of production is overcome and unity in relations between man and the implements of production and between man and nature is attained; this unity is on a considerably high level of the productive forces which makes it possible to ensure all-round, harmonious development of the individual.

2. Genuine economy which saves working time becomes identical with the development of the productive force, of the capacity to produce. Greater labour productivity does not lead to forced unemployment but makes labour easier, enriches its content, improves its quality and develops the abilities of the working man.

¹ K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part II, p. 118.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 506.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Notes on Plekhanov's Second Draft Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1977, p. 52.

3. "In relation to the man who is still in process of shaping himself it [this direct production process] is a school of discipline, while in relation to the fully shaped man, whose mind has absorbed the knowledge accumulated by society, it is application [of knowledge], experimental science, materially creative science objectifying itself."¹ In other words, the process of labour turns from unavoidable drudgery into a creative process of man's moral education and development.

4. Production and consumption are two inseparable parts of a whole, two aspects of the new man which are revealed in the process of labour. Overcoming the contradiction between production and consumption is "by no means *renunciation of consumption* but development ... of capacities for production and therefore development of both capacities for and means of consumption. The capacity for consumption ... is the development of an individual ability, productive power".²

5. "The saving of labour time is tantamount to an increase in leisure, i.e., time for the full development of the individual which itself reacts as the greatest productive force on the productive power of labour. From the standpoint of the direct production process, it can be regarded as production of *capital fixé*, this *capital fixé* being man himself."³ One might note in passing that bourgeois theorists discovered "human capital" more than 100 years after Marx, and even then they saw it merely as a new, sometimes profitable field for investment. That they ignore completely the humanitarian aspect of it is clear from an analysis of the crudely anthropological concepts now fashionable in the West. As a rule, they are merely a rehash of the ideas which Marx and his followers critically exposed and scientifically, positively overcame a long time ago.

Thus Marx identified, while established socialism demonstrated in practical terms, the complex chain rich in feedback: crea-

¹ K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, S. 599-600.

² *Ibid.*, S. 599.

³ *Ibid.*

tive labour—savings in working time—development of capacities for production—development of personal consumption as an element of the individual's development—increased leisure and full development of the individual. The highest point here is man, the individual, his freedom and development. It took Marx, Lenin and their followers today a titanic *mental* effort to make this discovery. But the effort was just as great in terms of *practice*, the diverse and many-sided practice of shaping the new man.

Preparing to tackle this world historical task, Marxist-Leninists encountered a range of new theoretical problems connected with the identification of specific ways and forms of shaping the new man, with the need to overcome the age-old prejudices and traditions, the lack of cultural development and the humility of working people—their legacy of the past. Practice revealed much that was not foreseen in theory. The dialectical interaction of theory and practice permeated the development of the Marxist-Leninist concept of man in his relations to a society moving toward communism and the shaping of the new man—the product and the principal motive force of this society's development.

The dialectics of the shaping of the new man is such that, on the one hand, this is what all the advances of socialism in the economic, social and cultural spheres depend on. On the other hand, the shaping of the new man is itself determined by the level of production, the character of labour, the social relations, and the cultural level of men. This dialectical understanding forms the basis of the strategy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet government in the social sphere and in relation to the development of the individual. This strategy is expressed in the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU which set forth a clear-cut and carefully elaborated programme envisaging the development of socialist social conditions for the realisation of the substantive potential of man and his future; intensive economic development on the basis of scientific and technological progress; improved management and better and conscious labour discipline; elimination of differences between

classes, of the substantial differences between town and country and between intellectual and physical labour; greater social homogeneity of society; comprehensive development and convergence of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR; and the development of socialist democracy and of the socialist way of life.

The subsequent resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee—above all of its November 1982 Plenary Session; the provisions of the speech delivered there by Comrade Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—have set new tasks for the development of production, the tackling of social problems, the shaping of the new man and the development of his professional skills, labour discipline, consciousness and ethics. Here, many problems remain outstanding, and they must be and are being solved in a way which conforms to our society's motto "Everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man". One can sum up all these issues and say that the central task here is the *purposeful and integrated development of man as an individual* which means his *cultural growth* in the broadest sense of the term.

It appears that there is still much for our scholars to do in carrying out a truly *integrated* examination of the ways of shaping the new man—of the new, communist civilisation. The 26th Congress of the CPSU stressed the need for precisely this approach. It is the duty of Marxist scholars representing both social and other sciences to effectively follow this Party guideline.

Thus, from the general theoretical definitions worked out by Marx and Marxist-Leninists and dealing with the essence, ways, means, problems and contradictions of the world historical process of man's emancipation, we have logically arrived at a number of practical problems concerning man, as they are raised and solved in communist-bound socialist society. This is natural because the very in-depth essence of Marx's doctrine calls for that—not only to explain but also to transform man in the world and the world of man. This is a graphic expression of the true humanitarian spirit of Marxism which com-

bines a scientific approach with practical efficiency. This is why Marx called it *real humanitarianism*. It is precisely Marxism that undertakes today the greatest world historical mission of man's emancipation and development. It is precisely Marxism that, to all progressive mankind, is synonymous with humanitarianism. What Prometheus has done in the myths Marx has accomplished in science and in real life and his followers, Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, are doing today.

Kommunist, No. 6, 1983

THEODOR OIZERMAN

Member of the USSR
Academy of Sciences

A REVOLUTIONARY LANDMARK IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL THOUGHT

This year working people all over the world, all progressive-minded people are commemorating the 165th anniversary of the birth and the 100th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, that great social thinker and revolutionary, the founder of the scientific socialist ideology. The whole of Marx's not very long life was devoted to the social emancipation of the oppressed and exploited. As creator of the scientifico-philosophical, dialectical materialist world-view, the theory of scientific communism, and the scientific political economy, and as organiser of the First International, Marx has won a permanent place in the history of humanity, whose present and future are indissolubly linked with his teaching.

It was in Prometheus, the noblest of all the heroes of Greek mythology, the titan who stole fire from the gods and gave it to man, that Marx saw the embodiment of man's true vocation. And Marx himself was the Prometheus of the working class. He gave it its revolutionary philosophy and its scientific socialist consciousness, without which there can be no abolition of capitalism or building of the new society.

One of today's apologists of capitalism, William S. Schlamm charges Marx with the "Prometheus heresy". "Communism," this zealous adversary of progress proclaims, "is the culminating hubris of Promethean man who reaches out for the world and wishes to create it anew."¹

¹ William S. Schlamm, *Die Grenzen des Wunders*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, 1959, S. 189.

This unfortunate ideologist of the bourgeoisie obviously has no idea that his condemnation of communism is, in fact, an acknowledgement of the bourgeoisie's ideological bankruptcy. Today the fundamental opposition between Marxism, the truly scientific substantiation of humanism, and the reactionary ideology of the capitalist class, has become even more apparent than at any time in the past. Equally apparent is the creative power of our revolutionary theory.

One of the fundamental sources of the viability, veracity, and historical perspective of the revolutionary world-view evolved by Marx is its partisanship, its inseparable connection with the destiny of the working class, the aims of its emancipation movement. It was no accident that Lenin considered the main thing in Marxism to be the message that the working class has a world-historic mission, the mission of abolishing all forms of exploitation and oppression, and building a classless, communist society.

In the 1840s, when Marx and his great collaborator, Frederick Engels, formulated the basic principles of this message, not only feudal reactionaries but even liberal bourgeois thinkers regarded the existence of the proletariat as a historical misfortune and a grave menace to social prosperity. They treated proletarians as an "uncritical" mass of paupers lacking any social or moral supports. Marx and Engels exposed the reactionary social essence of these views.

Marxism arose as the theory behind the movement for the emancipation of the working class. Marx and Engels proved that the proletariat is society's greatest productive force, and that its struggle against capitalism is the decisive force of historical progress. The proletariat stands out from the whole mass of exploited humanity as the class directly connected with the progressive and constantly developing means of production. It grows and becomes better organised and increasingly active. Marx singled out the proletariat as the most revolutionary class and showed that it has the *leading* role to play in

the movement for the emancipation of all the exploited and oppressed. According to Marx, an essential condition for successful revolutionary change is the setting up and development of a communist party. The Communists, wrote Marx and Engels, are "practically, the most . . . resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; . . . theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the . . . general results of the proletarian movement".¹

Marx saw far ahead, anticipating that the historical development of the proletariat would correspond to capitalist progress and intensification of the internal antagonistic contradictions inherent in such advance. "It is not a question of what this or that proletariat, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment *regards* as its aim. It is a question of *what the proletariat is*, and what, in accordance with this *being*, it will historically be compelled to do. Its aim and historical action is visibly and irrevocably foreshadowed in its own life situation as well as in the whole organisation of bourgeois society today."² All subsequent history and our own epoch in particular prove the truth of this prescient statement.

Marx's theory that the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, the necessity of the dictatorship of the working class, guided by the Communist Party, conform to certain objective laws, was based on a scientific study of human history, on the economic laws of the rise and development of capitalist production and on generalisation of the historical experience of the class struggle and bourgeois revolutions. The overall philosophical basis of this all-embracing study is provided by the *dialectical materialist interpretation of world history*, evolved by Marx.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 497.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, "The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Criticism", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, 1975, p. 37.

Before Marx there was no science of society, no scientific theory of social development, despite the large number of studies devoted to the history of the ancient world, the Middle Ages, and later periods. These historical works, or the works of the pre-Marxian economists, philosophers and socialists, should not, of course, be underestimated. The materialist interpretation of history would have been impossible without them. Marx pointed out that his predecessors had described the class struggle, but that they had no notion of the causes that divided society into opposed classes, of the laws, the necessity of the class struggle. The failure to understand the objective foundations of the class structure of society, the economic basis of the political domination of a certain class, the class character of the state as a specific form of the domination of one class over another, the failure to understand the decisive role of social being in relation to social consciousness—all these things made it impossible to create a science of society, to discover the laws governing social development.

Marx proved that the existence of historically determined classes (slaves and slave-owners, serfs and landowners, proletarians and capitalists) depended on the level and character of the productive forces and the corresponding production relations. Amid all the vast diversity of social relations he put his finger on those that were fundamental and decisive, i.e., production relations. Taken together, he told us, they form the economic structure of society, which provides the basis for its political organisation and intellectual life. Material production, which pre-Marxian thinkers had seen as a tiresome extraneous necessity, was for the first time fully comprehended as production not only of objects, but also of social relations, and ultimately of *social* man himself.

Marx was the first to make a scientific investigation of the material conditions under which the masses lived and the changes that were taking place in these conditions. His work revealed the decisive role of the masses in the development of society and provided a scientific explanation for such important phenomena as social revolutions in the history of class society.

Revolutions, Marx wrote, are the locomotives of history. The social creativity of the masses shows itself with particular force in an epoch of revolutionary transformation of social relations. The increasing role of the masses is one of the objective laws of social progress discovered by Marx: "Together with the thoroughness of the historical action, the size of the mass whose action it is will therefore increase."¹

The materialist interpretation of history has raised sociology to the level of a science by uncovering the intrinsic connections between human activity and the objective laws of social development. People make their history themselves, said the pre-Marxian materialists. But these materialists could not explain how this was possible if external nature and the nature of man himself were independent of people. Marx gave a brilliant answer to this question. He proved that in changing the environmenting nature people also change their social nature, because the essence of man is the sum total of all social relations.

The basis of the life of society is material production; the productive forces of society that have been or will be created in this process are the result of the activity of many generations. "Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past."² So humanity itself creates the objective conditions that determine its existence and development.

The subjective and objective sides of the historical process are equally important. Developing Marx's theory, Lenin explained that objective historical necessity could not exist without having some relations to people, to classes.

In certain epochs certain classes "take charge" of historical necessity and their activity and organisation determine how and

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Criticism", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 82.

² K. Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 1979, p. 103.

to what extent this necessity is realised. Lenin pointed out that Marx considered history from the standpoint of the working class fighting for its social emancipation. This partisan position, which is inherent in Marxism, is a necessary expression of its profoundly scientific nature.

The materialist interpretation of history provided a scientific explanation of the essence of the antagonistic social relations and led to the conclusion that social antagonisms are not eternal. As Lenin observes, Marx gave an objective analysis of the laws of the functioning and developing of capitalism and "showed the *necessity* of exploitation under that system".¹

This exposed the reformist doctrines that antagonistic social relations could be overcome under capitalist conditions. As Lenin stresses, Marx saw the main task of his investigation in "...*disclosing all the forms of antagonism and exploitation in modern society, tracing their evolution, demonstrating their transitory character, the inevitability of their transformation into a different form, and thus serving the proletariat as a means of ending all exploitation as quickly and easily as possible*".²

To sum up, then, the supreme aim of the science of society is to give the working class and its allies a true slogan of struggle which, while reflecting the actual historical necessity, points out the ways and means of realising that necessity. Although they exposed and condemned capitalism, the utopian socialists could see neither its historical inevitability nor the objective necessity of its final collapse. Marx, on the other hand, showed how the actual conditions of development of capitalism itself gave rise to this necessity.

The economic preconditions of socialism take shape in the womb of capitalist society. The concentration and centralisation

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, 1977, p. 158.

² *Ibid.*, p. 327.

of capital are an objective law of capitalist development, which tends to make production increasingly social in nature. Admittedly, capitalist socialisation of the means of production takes place on the basis of private property, through its enlargement and centralisation. Hence, the inevitability of conflict between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. Only the socialist revolution, by abolishing private ownership of the means of production, resolves this antagonistic contradiction.

The irresistible magnetism of Marx's teaching, wrote Lenin, lies in its organic fusing of a strictly scientific approach with a consistently revolutionary spirit. It was not merely that Marx combined the qualities of a brilliant scientist and great revolutionary. Unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice are intrinsically inherent in Marxist theory, which interprets and generalises the historical experience of humanity, the experience of the struggle for the emancipation of all the oppressed and exploited. The unfailing creative strength of Marxism, its veracity and implacable hostility to dogmatism, doctrinairism and pedantry, lies in the inseparable connection between thought and action, scientific research and revolutionary struggle.

Almost as soon as Marxism appeared, its bourgeois critics insisted that it was "obsolete". They go on peddling the same notion today, on the grounds that Marx exposed the capitalism of the 19th century, and since then capitalism has changed beyond recognition. These "critics" obviously ignore the fact that the theory of Marxism long ago, as Lenin noted, "has become the doctrine of millions and tens of millions of proletarians all over the world, who are applying it in their struggle against capitalism".¹ As for the bourgeois assertions that 20th century capitalism differs essentially from that of the 19th century, this is quite true

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 1974, p. 286.

and it was proved by Lenin himself, the greatest continuer of Marx, in his theory of imperialism as the highest and final, monopoly stage in the development of capitalism.

Leninism is the Marxism of the present epoch, the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism. It is the creative development of the proletarian world-view, organically combining Marxist analysis of the present epoch with the legacy of Marx and Engels. Today being a Marxist means continuing the work of Lenin. As the facts show, any opposing of Marx's teaching to Leninism involves distortion of that teaching and going over to the positions of anti-Marxism.

The documents of the CPSU and other communist parties record the further development of Marxism-Leninism. The practice of communist construction provides not only a realisation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, but also a basis for enriching this theory with new theoretical propositions. The conception of the developed socialist society produced by the contemporary followers of Marx, Engels and Lenin is a vivid testimony to the creative character of Marxism-Leninism. The strength of Communist Party policy lies in its scientific approach, in its reliance on deep-going investigation and application of the laws of social progress.

A developed socialist society has been built in the USSR. Socialism has also become a reality in a number of European (and not only European) countries. It stands in opposition to the capitalist mode of production as a new socio-economic formation, to which the future belongs. All this is a great triumph for the theories evolved by Marx and Lenin. By its very existence and successful development the world socialist system signifies a radical change in the direction of social development.

The interpretation and theoretical study of this new stage in world history are a vitally important task for Marxist scholars at the present time. Yuri Andropov, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, writes, "The person who asks himself, 'What is socialism?' and turns for the answer first of all to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is doing the right thing. But he should not stop there. Today the con-

cept 'socialism' cannot be fully understood without taking into account the very rich practical experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries." But, he goes on, this "experience shows that successes in socialist construction come when the policy of the ruling Communist Party rests on a sound scientific foundation. Any underestimation of the role of Marxist-Leninist science and its creative development, any narrow pragmatic interpretation of its aims, or disregard of the fundamental problems of theory, any imposition of opportunistic demands or scholastic theoretising can have serious political and ideological consequences".¹

Our theory, Marx and Engels used to say, is not a dogma but a guide to action. This truth was constantly emphasised by Lenin, who creatively developed and applied Marx's theory. The further awakening and spread of social consciousness among working people who take an active part in the struggle for socialism and communism on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory, which is constantly developing and at the same time remains true to its scientific principles, provides a sure guarantee that the great historic task of the communist renewal of the world will be accomplished.

Pravda, February 25, 1983.

¹ See this book, pp. 30, 32.

BONIFATI KEDROV

Member of the USSR
Academy of Sciences

MARX AND SCIENCE

Engels called Marx a man of science in his obituary. Indeed, Marx was not only a great revolutionary and leader of the international proletariat but also a great scholar. He approached science itself as a scholar, defining its subject, method, social mission and also its prospects as scientific knowledge, its future. This approach and understanding expressed by Marx are extremely topical today.

Marx displayed profound understanding of the way scientific knowledge moved and of the most important law guiding this movement—from the outward aspects of the phenomena in question to the discovery of their inner essence and of the laws behind these phenomena. That is why “it is a work of science to resolve the visible, merely external movement into the true intrinsic movement”¹ and, as he says further, “all science would be superfluous if the outward appearance and the essence of things directly coincided”.²

Marx's postulate about the movement of knowledge from phenomena to the essence is confirmed continuously. For example, that is the way the essence and the laws governing the movement of developed socialist society toward communism manifest themselves; and that is the way the true nature of the militarist, predatory policy of contemporary imperialism is re-

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, p. 313.

² *Ibid.*, p. 817.

vealed. There is the same movement from phenomena to the essence in the natural sciences: biology has advanced greatly thanks to its delving into the essence of heredity and metabolism, while in atomic physics the movement of knowledge into the heart of the nuclear processes, into their essence and laws, makes it possible to master these processes more and more fully so as to apply them in practice.

It is very important that, in dealing with the development patterns of scientific knowledge, Marx identifies the three elements of its rhythm: from studying the original whole, i.e., the evolved subject in all its complexity as given directly, to examining this subject's various aspects by the elaboration of appropriate abstractions, to integrating them together so as to speculatively reconstruct the original object in its entirety and specific manifestations.

The profound dialectical contradiction of this movement is that the whole cannot be grasped without first approaching it not as a whole, without taking it apart. Lenin wrote: "We cannot imagine, express, measure, depict movement, without interrupting continuity, without simplifying, coarsening, dismembering, strangling that which is living. The representation of movement by means of thought always makes coarse, kills,—and not only by means of thought, but also by sense-perception, and not only of movement, but *every* concept.

"And in that lies the *essence* of dialectics.

"And precisely *this essence* is expressed by the formula: the unity, identity of opposites."¹

The entire history of natural science from antiquity to this day remarkably confirms these precepts, laid down by Marx and developed by Lenin. For example, the history of physics, specifically of optics, shows that in order to grasp the essence of light, it was first broken down into two opposite aspects: one approach presented light as a continuity of waves, while the other saw it as an intermittent corpuscular entity. In our century, quantum mechanics has demonstrated that the two

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, 1980, pp. 257-58.

sides are inseparable, and light has manifested itself as a unity of opposites.

Marx substantiated a scientific method which took into account the dialectical contradictoriness of knowledge and was based on the principle of development—the method of advancing from the abstract, i.e., the undeveloped, the embryonic, the poor in definitions, to the specific, i.e., the developed, the rich in definitions. In this approach, “the procedure of abstract reasoning which advances from the simplest to more complex concepts . . . conforms to actual historical development”.¹

This method of knowledge calls for proceeding from the initial, simplest relation which Marx called the “cell”, borrowing this notion from biology. For all its extreme simplicity and abstract nature, the “cell” of political economy resisted efforts to grasp it for over two thousand years. “Why?” Marx asks, and replies: “Because the body, as an organic whole, is more easy of study than are the cells of that body.”² Marx himself looked for it for many years until he discovered that commodity is the economic “cell” of bourgeois society.

“In his *Capital*,” Lenin wrote, “Marx first analyses the simplest, most ordinary and fundamental, most common and everyday *relation* of bourgeois (commodity) society, a relation encountered billions of times, viz. the exchange of commodities. In this very simple phenomenon (in this ‘cell’ of bourgeois society) analysis reveals *all* the contradictions (or the germs of *all* the contradictions) of modern society.”³

Actually, many modern sciences which have reached a high development level and evolved complete structures are presented according to the method of advancing from the abstract to the specific. For example, chemistry became a science with the discovery of its “cells”—chemical elements. Organic chemistry found its “cells” in the 1860s; these were hydrocarbons whose theory was

¹ K. Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, p. 208.

² K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1977, p. 19.

³ V. I. Lenin, “On the Question of Dialectics”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, pp. 358-59.

developed by Karl Schorlemmer, a friend of Marx. In N. S. Kurnakov's theory of physical and chemical analysis, the "cells" were the chemical components forming multicomponent systems.

Marx's scientific method as applied to political economy is firmly established as part of the treasury of modern science. It is applied in various branches of knowledge, and sometimes without the scientists themselves being aware of it. Materialist dialectics forms the basis of both fruitful scientific knowledge and of sound social transformations.

"Science," Engels said, "was for Marx a historically dynamic, revolutionary force. However great the joy with which he welcomed a new discovery in some theoretical science whose practical application perhaps it was as yet quite impossible to envisage, he experienced quite another kind of joy when the discovery involved immediate revolutionary change in industry, and in historical development in general."¹

In his preparatory manuscripts for *Capital* Marx wrote: "...The *development of science*, this ideal and at the same time practical wealth, is only one aspect, one form in which the *development of the productive forces of man*, i.e., the development of wealth appears."² This shows us, first, how closely Marx connected science, above all natural science, with the productive forces of society and, second, how he took into account the two aspects of science—the ideal one and the practical, actual one.

Carrying these ideas further, Marx arrived at the conclusion about the transformation of science into a direct productive force of society. After all, nature builds no technical devices or facilities. "These are *organs of man's mind created with man's hands*, the objectified power of knowledge. The develop-

¹ F. Engels, "Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx", in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, pp. 162-63.

² K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*, Moscow, 1939, S. 439.

ment of *capital fixé* is an indicator of the degree to which the universal knowledge of society has become a *direct productive force* and hence an indicator of the degree to which . . . the social productive forces are created not only in the form of knowledge but also as direct organs of social practice, of life's actual process."¹

Hence the conclusion: "The productive development of society is not only the growth of scientific power but also the extent to which it is posited as *capital fixé*, the volume, the scope of its realisation and its mastery of the totality of production."²

What then are the mechanics of interaction between science and production, between the ideal and the material aspects of science in the process of its transformation into a direct productive force of society? Transformed into something ideal—into scientific concepts, theories, etc.—universal knowledge (i.e., science) must again be translated into objects, into material technical devices, facilities and technologies necessary for production. The result is a relatively closed cycle, reproduced anew on a higher plane: renewed production, as a material factor, again and again stimulates the transformation of the material into the ideal, so that this new ideal could again and again translate itself into objects in the course of production.

Marx saw the distinctive feature of human labour in that it was purposeful activity. From the very beginning, before manufacturing the desired article from a material, the man engaged in the process of labour imagines it, plans it mentally. "At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement",³ i.e. ideally.

This provides the key to understanding the essence of the scientific and technological revolution. It is not only that two revolutions—in science and in technology—have now merged

¹ *Ibid.*, S. 594.

² *Ibid.*, S. 636.

³ K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 174.

to form a single historical process; it is not only that today science advances faster than technology and blazes the trail for it. The important point is that two heretofore separate processes—the transformation of the material (of natural laws) into the ideal (into natural science) in man's mind and the reverse transformation of the ideal into objects in the course of production—have merged into a single continuous cycle. The continuous, uninterrupted operation of this cycle is both the condition and the indicator of how effectively and fully men manage and direct this scientific and technological revolution. Of decisive importance here is the final element of this cycle—the timely and full introduction of scientific and technological advances into mass production.

At the November 1982 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee much was said about the great latent potential of our economy, to be tapped by accelerating scientific and technological progress and by broadly and promptly applying the achievements of science, technology and advanced expertise in production. As Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said, to promote the introduction of new technologies and new methods of work one should not simply publicise them but also identify and remove the specific causes hampering scientific and technological progress. "Planning methods and the system of material incentives should promote the linking up of science and production. Those who boldly introduce new technologies should not find themselves at a disadvantage."¹

That is the way our Party and its Central Committee implement, in the present conditions, Marx's postulates about the connection of science with production, of ideal universal knowledge with the practical material activity of Soviet society.

Marx's ideas are as alive and topical today as they were 100 years ago.

¹ *Records of the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, November 22, 1982, Moscow, 1982, p. 10 (in Russian).*

There is another question that could be raised: what were the long-term prospects of scientific development that Marx mapped out and how are his forecasts confirmed today?

In the mid-1840s, when Marx was working on his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, scientific knowledge was still in its one-sidedly analytical stage: the sciences still kept up their rigid isolation from one another and comparison between them was only made on an external plane. Nevertheless, Marx's brilliant vision enabled him to discern the ways of scientific development for decades to come. Marx stressed that *practically* natural science has invaded and transformed human life through the medium of industry, because *industry* is the *actual* relationship of nature, and therefore of natural science, to man.

In this connection Marx examined the *human* essence of nature or the *natural* essence of man and demonstrated that in this aspect, natural science was to lose its one-sided abstract tendency and become the basis of human science, as it has already become the basis of human life.

That was how Marx charted the way to a unity of nature and man and, on that basis, to a unity of the natural science and the science of man and of society. Industry and, consequently, technology, its integral part, appear in this context as the connecting link between nature and man (the technical sciences, therefore, as the connecting link between the natural and the social sciences). Hence Marx's remarkable forecast, vigorously translated into life today. "History itself," Marx continued, "is a *real* part of *natural history*—of nature developing into man. Natural science will in time incorporate into itself the science of man, just as the science of man will incorporate into itself natural science: there will be *one* science."¹

The convergence of the natural and the social sciences, with vigorous assistance of the science of industry and technology, does not at all imply a levelling out of the various previously

¹ K. Marx, "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, pp. 303-04.

established fields of scientific knowledge, or a glossing over of their separate identities. It merely implies, first, that they would no longer be one-sided and isolated as before and, second, that they would all be permeated with a common scientific method which makes it possible to approach the problems and methods of different sciences from common basic positions of methodology.

A passage from *The German Ideology*, written by Marx together with Engels, has an extremely topical modern meaning: "We know only a single science, the science of history. One can look at history from two sides and divide it into the history of nature and the history of men. The two sides are, however, inseparable; the history of nature and the history of men are dependent on each other so long as men exist."¹

Marx's ideas about the natural and the social sciences converging as nature and society move closer to each other through industry and technology were developed by Lenin.

"*Mechanical and Chemical Technique* serves human ends," Lenin wrote, "just because its character (essence) consists in its being determined by external conditions (the laws of nature)."²

Hence the dual nature of technology's relations with other factors: "*Technique* and the *Objective* world, *Technique* and *Ends*."³

Knowledge of the laws of nature comes to man from the natural sciences. Man's practical (production, industrial, technological) activity is aimed at putting knowledge of the laws of nature at the service of meeting the requirements of human society. This is the heart of Marx's forecast about the fusion of the social and the natural sciences into one single science of the future.

The entire subsequent historical development of science and practice has followed the way Marx foresaw, the sciences deal-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, "The German Ideology", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 1976, p. 28.

² V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 188.

³ *Ibid.*

ing with nature and the sciences dealing with society growing closer together via their connecting link—the sciences dealing with industry and technology. This organic convergence calls for a comprehensive Marxist analysis of the scientific and technological revolution and its essence.

In full swing since the middle of the 20th century, it implies organic fusion of two revolutions which have previously occurred in two distinct spheres of human activity—natural science and technology. Their merger into a single process experiences the impact of socio-economic factors too, and this, in turn, entails profound social consequences which differ radically in capitalist countries, in socialist countries and in developing countries. An analysis of the profoundly contradictory process of the scientific and technological revolution leads to the conclusion about the need for an integrated, interconnected development of the social, natural and technical sciences. It is this integrated development that makes it possible to find comprehensive solutions to the problems of scientific and technological, socio-economic and cultural progress.

The close intermarriage of the three main groups of sciences is indispensable for an integrated examination of today's global phenomena posed by the study of the environment, space research, research into science itself and into the scientific, technological, artistic and social creative effort (psychology of the creative effort), etc. Development of all these fields of knowledge is possible only given the unity and deepest possible interpenetration of the sciences dealing with nature, society and technology.

All the above highlights the fundamental, policy-making meaning of the decisions taken by the 25th and 26th congresses of the CPSU, stressing the need to enhance the interconnection and interaction of the social, natural and technical sciences.




Socialism is vitally interested in the progress of science on the basis of Marx's strategic ideas.

Pravda, April 7, 1983

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.



СЛАВА ВСЕ
СОВЕТСКОМУ